



Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports

2020

Toward an Understanding of the Professional Work of NCAA Division I Soccer Coaches

Lynda Ellen Bowers

West Virginia University, lynda.bowers@mail.wvu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bowers, Lynda Ellen, "Toward an Understanding of the Professional Work of NCAA Division I Soccer Coaches" (2020). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 7569.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/7569>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

2020

Toward an Understanding of the Professional Work of NCAA Division I Soccer Coaches

Lynda Ellen Bowers

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Toward an Understanding of the Professional Work of NCAA Division I Soccer Coaches

Lynda Bowers, M.S.Ed.

**Dissertation submitted to the
College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences at
West Virginia University**

**In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in
Coaching and Teaching Studies**

**Kristen Dieffenbach, Ph.D., Chair
Malayna Bernstein, Ph.D.
James Hannon, Ph.D.
Julie Patrick, Ph.D.**

Department of Coaching and Teaching Studies

**Morgantown, West Virginia
2020**

**Keywords: sport coaching, coaching education, NCAA Division I coaches,
professional development, professionalization of coaching
Copyright 2020 Lynda Bowers**

ABSTRACT

Toward an Understanding of the Professional Work of NCAA Division I Soccer Coaches

Lynda Bowers, M.S.Ed

Very little is known about the professional work of NCAA Division I (DI) coaches, which poses challenges for coach educators to create relevant professional development opportunities for coaches in this context. The present study looked at the full scope of work of NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coaches. The aim of this project was to explore the coaches' perspectives of their jobs to improve our understanding of the contextual nuances of working in a DI environment. In this qualitative study, four participants were interviewed in-person utilizing a vignette-style, semi-structured interview guide. Data were analyzed using an interpretivist-constructivist approach (Sparks & Smith, 2014) and applied thematic analysis (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012). Higher and lower-order themes were categorized under the following headings: DI contextual characteristics, job responsibilities, coaching processes, knowledge requirements, and job challenges. Key findings included the amount of resources and pressure to win at the DI level, attention given to recruiting, the required managerial skills needed to perform the job effectively, and the challenges of communicating and motivating Generation Z athletes. These findings offer foundational information needed to better understand the professional work of DI collegiate coaching. More research is needed in this area to fill the gaps in the literature about this understudied population of coaches.

Acknowledgements

I want to give a special thanks to all of my committee members, Dr. Kristen Dieffenbach, Dr. Julie Patrick, Dr. Malayna Bernstein, and Dr. James Hannon. Your time and expertise are invaluable to me. Next, I must acknowledge three groups of people. First, the faculty at WVU that kept me on track, gave me much-needed critical feedback, and supported me during this process. Two people in particular were instrumental in completing this project – Dr. Kristen Dieffenbach and Dr. Eloise Elliott. Both pushed me to keep going and did not accept excuses! Secondly, I want to give credit to all of my former coaches, players, and athletic directors that influenced my coaching career. My academic pathway in coaching education was greatly inspired through these relationships. Finally, I give the most thanks to my very supportive family – my husband, Doug, my son, Micah, and my daughter, Casey. Your patience and grace allowed me the opportunity to fulfill a long-awaited dream. I love you very much!

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	5
Participants and Sampling.....	6
Procedures.....	8
Recruitment.....	8
Data Collection.....	8
Data Analysis.....	11
Results.....	13
DI Contextual Characteristics.....	13
Job Responsibilities.....	15
Coaching Processes.....	20
Knowledge Requirements.....	28
Job Challenges.....	34
Discussion.....	37
Limitations.....	43
Implications and Future Research.....	44
References.....	46

Appendix

Appendix A Table 1: Participant Expert Criteria Summary.....	55
Appendix B Table 2: Categories and Themes: Professional Work of NCAA DI FBS Coaches ..	56
Appendix C: Chapter 1 Introduction.....	57
Appendix D: Chapter 2 Extended Review of Literature	67
Appendix E: Chapter 3 Methods.....	106
Appendix F: Chapter 4 Extended Results.....	114
Appendix G: Extended Reference List.....	148
Appendix H Table 4: International Sport Coaching Framework: Coaching Roles.....	160
Appendix I Table 5: Comparing the Tasks of High-Performance Coaches.....	161
Appendix J Table 6: Division I Head Women’s Soccer Coach Job Descriptions from the NCAA Marketplace.....	162
Appendix K: Recruiting Email.....	164
Appendix L: Qualtrics Survey.....	165
Appendix M: Follow up Communication for Interview Scheduling.....	169
Appendix N: Interview Guide.....	171
Appendix O: NCAA DI FBS Head Women’s Soccer Coach Job Description.....	174
Appendix P Table 7: Table of Coding Frequencies.....	175
Appendix Q Table 3: Table of Extended Categories and Themes.....	177

Introduction

As coach developers and academics seek to support the coaching profession, it is imperative that they know the needs of coaches and the context in which they work. This is difficult because coaches work in a variety of contexts based on sport domain, organization, participation vs. performance pathway, sport culture, and gender of participants (Côté and Gilbert (2009), which poses challenges on how to best train them in the profession. Before considering coaching education, there must be a better understanding about what coaches do within these varied contexts.

One of the most fundamental differences between coaching contexts relates to competition level and desired outcomes (Erickson et al., 2008). The high-performance coaching environment typically refers to Olympic or professional sport organizations (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016). Coaches within these environments contend with the rise of commercialism, the club or country's financial investments, the high stakes of winning, and the management of resources (2016). Further, high-performance coaches are required to select and develop elite athletes. In National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I (DI) athletic organizations, coaches operate at the highest level of collegiate competition. They work in environments that are multifaceted, high-paced, and time-consuming (Dixon & Bruening, 2007) and share many of the characteristics of high-performance environments. Yet, little is known about how coaches perceive their environment or the ways in which their job is impacted by the contextual nuances of the NCAA DI organization. What is known is that the organizational structures and expectations can influence the roles that coaches play and the way in which coaches achieve desired outcomes (Lyle, 2002). According to Blau (1964), workers are dependent on organizations to achieve their objectives. Conversely, organizations are dependent

on workers to help attain its goals. This reciprocal relationship in athletic organizations was studied by Rocha and Chelladurai (2011). They discovered that positive relationships between DI coaches and athletic organizations led to greater affective commitment, and thus, enhanced performance. What is yet to be discovered, however, is the way in which the organizational environment impacts the coach's work, itself.

Prior research studied DI coaches that were deemed to be experts in their field like Pat Summitt, John Wooden, and Anson Dorrance (Becker & Wrisberg, 2008; Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; Silva, 2006), but the literature focused on their behaviors and training concepts not the occupational demands of the DI work environment. According to organizational behavior literature, work is described by collecting details about the occupation such as: preliminary and critical tasks performed and necessary competencies including the knowledge, skills, abilities, and behaviors required to perform a work role (Schneider & Konz, 1989). Schein (1990) added that the mission of the organization, its goals, and latent functions as they pertain to the environment were considerations for understanding work. Therefore, it makes sense to gain more insight of the contextual elements of NCAA DI FBS organizations.

Coaching at this level requires more than technical and tactical sport knowledge. Extensive research has established the complexities of requisite knowledge of high-performance coaches including managerial, instructional, intrapersonal, and interpersonal knowledge (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Rynne, Mallett, & Rabjohns, 2017), including those within NCAA coaching (Humphreys, Paul, & Weinbach, 2016; Readdy, Zakrajsek, & Raabe, 2016; Yukelson & Rose, 2014). Recently, research about the skills and processes of NCAA coaches has pointed to the need for coaches to be excellent communicators, highly adaptable, relational, and possess the ability to orchestrate socially-complex systems (Elliott & McCullick, 2018; Harvey et al., 2017;

Readdy et al., 2016). Still, not enough work has been done to clarify what coaches know or what processes they employ within the contemporary DI working environments. When considering future programs in professional coaching development, a greater understanding of relevant coaching knowledge and the organizational components unique to specific coaching contexts must be present.

NCAA DI FBS Athletics

Athletic organizations. NCAA DI FBS athletic organizations are institutions that operate within the DI Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). These programs are described as having vast financial and human resources funded by television contracts and ticket sales from revenue sports (e.g. men's basketball and football) (Humphreys et al., 2016). Not only are FBS schools known for their revenue potential, but they also tout hefty expenses. To that point, FBS schools are commercially-driven enterprises (Weight, Cooper, & Popp, 2015) with substantially larger recruiting budgets, scholarship offerings, and coaches' salaries than their non-FBS counterparts (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). However, beyond the revenue and expenses, little is known about the organizational components of DI FBS athletic programs. Consequently, research around non-revenue athletic programs, like women's soccer, is also absent from the literature. One older empirical study looked at DI athletic organizational structures from a macro-organizational perspective (Cunningham & Dixon, 2003) and found that organizations that have structured job roles and employee autonomy have more desirable work outcomes than other structures. However, this study was conducted before the FBS was instated, and it did not look at the intersectionality of the organization's influence on the job of the coach.

NCAA DI coaches. NCAA DI coaches are unique in that they operate in a corporate atmosphere, under an academic umbrella. Their work mimics the professional environment, yet

renders human services (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2011). Like the business industry, there is pressure to win, heavy workloads, non-traditional schedules, constant search for success, and job insecurity, yet coaches are engaged in a zero-sum game where despite effort, sacrifice, or expertise, winning or losing is the ultimate metric of success (2011). Specific to non-revenue coaches, Readdy et al. (2016) studied NCAA head coaches (all divisions) to determine factors that describe the complexities of the coaching process. They concluded that NCAA coaches use similar processes as other high-performance coaches to achieve objectives (e.g., build relationships, orchestrate, empower staff, practice emotional/behavioral regulation, etc.), but the context-specific elements of working as a coach within an NCAA member institution (e.g. managing financial and human resources, micropolitics of winning and losing, recruiting elite athletes, and managing student-athletes) were not addressed. Similarly, Elliott and McCullick (2018) found that collegiate coaches believed their success centered in knowledge that was beyond sport. They credited their exceptional adaptability (success at multiple universities) to a deeper understanding of interpersonal relationships, cultivation of trust and respect from athletes, and a knack for engaging with assistant coaches. The study advanced what is known about how coaches use adaptability to evolve their coaching practice to the organizational culture, but it was not designed to specifically describe the overall work of a professional coach within a Division I context.

The present study looked specifically at the perceptions of work responsibilities of a unique subset of non-revenue sport coaches in DI FBS athletic organizations: head women's soccer coaches. To date, only two studies have been published using this coaching population (see Harvey et al., 2017; and Silva, 2006). Both were single-case studies and were not specific to capturing the whole scope of the coach's work.

Problem Statement

Supporting coaches – the athletic program’s greatest asset - requires investment to properly equip and train them such that the organization, itself, becomes more effective (Lawler, 1996). Yet without proper analysis of the job requirements unique to DI organization, the required competencies, or compulsory demands, it is difficult to imagine how athletic programs can properly support their coaches. Further, it remains challenging for those working within coaching education and development to create relevant professional development opportunities for coaches within this context without foundational knowledge of the work environment. In an effort to fill the gap in the literature, the purpose of this study was to explore the professional work of NCAA FBS Division I soccer coaches. Specifically, the broad research question for this study was: How do NCAA Division I FBS head women’s soccer coaches understand their professional work?

Methodology

Despite what is known about the work of high-performance coaches, there is still much to learn about specific subgroups in this context. Referring to the present study, very little is understood about high-performance coaches who work within the NCAA DI FBS, especially those of nonrevenue sport teams. Qualitative methods offer an effective way to understand a phenomenon in great depth and breadth. It has been suggested that sport and exercise science behaviors are best investigated through heuristic methods, using in-depth interviews and interpretational analysis (Côté et al., 1993). Additionally, coaching researchers have recommended that coaches, themselves, should be part of the research process to fully understand the pragmatic constraints of their work (Cooper & Allen, 2017; Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). These suggestions, along with the aim of the study, fit nicely within the constructs

of an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm which emphasizes that truth is created from multiple realities, socially constructed, and dependent upon people or groups for meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Former attempts of conceptualizing the coaching profession did not fully capture the work of coaches in specific contexts. In particular, the professional work of NCAA Division I FBS soccer coaches had yet to be studied. With the level of immaturity in NCAA coaching research, the current study drew from prior literature about high-performance coaches (e.g. Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Mallett et al., 2013; Rynne & Mallett, 2012) to compare across subgroups but also to discover any contextual differences. This was considered a preliminary study with the understanding that more work is necessary to build a body of research that would eventually help coach educators and developers provide quality professional development opportunities.

As is typical for studies conducted from the constructivist standpoint, the objective of the study was designed to make meaning of the work of NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coaches, including the contextual characteristics of working in a DI FBS institution, job responsibilities, requisite knowledge, job challenges, and coaching processes. A complete description of the methodology is outlined in the following order: 1) participants and sampling, 2) procedures, and 3) data analysis.

Participants and Sampling

High-performance coaches operate in similar environments as NCAA DI FBS coaches (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Readdy et al., 2016). Despite their similarities, previous literature about high-performance coaches (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Rynne & Mallett, 2016) has not included coaches their work within an NCAA organizational context. Further, any literature about the descriptors of an NCAA organization tends to be perceived from a revenue sport lens

(Humphreys et al., 2016). Therefore, sampling for the present study was purposive to include coaches that represented head women's soccer coaches in NCAA DI FBS institutions (Patton, 2002). Additionally, reliance on participants' perspectives about work experiences in an effort to understand a phenomenon requires a credible sample. Thus, an expert systems inclusion criterion was employed. This was modified from other studies who used a similar approach (Abraham, et al., 2006; Cooper & Allen, 2017; and Côté et al., 1995) to include the following criteria: (a) tenure as a Division I head coach for a minimum of ten years; (b) five years as an FBS head coach; (c) overall winning percentage of .500 at the Division I level; and (d) developed at least one NCAA All-American athlete. Typically, an expert systems approach utilizes a fifth criterion that shows the approval of colleagues within the coaching profession (e.g. coach of the year award at the conference or national level) but it was removed from selection criteria as it restricted the sample pool too far and it was deemed to be the weakest of the criteria given its subjective measurement. Furthermore, FBS coaches that worked in military universities were eliminated as it was thought to be outside the typical university environment. Last, coaches whose anonymity would be difficult to protect based on level of celebrity were also eliminated from participation.

Following purposive sampling, participants were conveniently sampled by constricting the geographical distance of participants (Flick, 2011). Only those within 250 miles driving distance of the interviewer (the mid-Atlantic region) were considered, as the research design included face-to-face interviews.

The appropriate number of participants for qualitative research is predicated on the research question and purpose of the study. The purpose of the present study was not to develop a new theory, nor was it an attempt to produce results of a representative sample that could be

generalized to a larger population. Rather, it was meant to add contextual depth to the current literature about high-performance coaching through an examination of the job experience within a unique organizational context. With the study aim in mind, the sample size included four participants ($n = 4$). The smaller sample size allowed for greater in-depth analysis and was used to collect preliminary results to create foundational points for further exploration of this population of coaches.

A review of the online coaching profiles of all Division I FBS head women's soccer coaches working within the mid-Atlantic region revealed that there were 16 coaches that met the initial selection criteria. Of the 16, four agreed to participate. Recognizing that detailed description of a small sample could violate anonymity of participants, reported demographics were limited to information deemed essential for understanding the results. The sample consisted of four NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coaches (3 males, 1 female) all over the age of 40. Coaching experience at the DI level ranged between 10 and 20+ years. FBS coaching experience ranged between 5 and 20+ years. Participants' winning percentage ranged from .60 to .73 ($M = .67$, $SD = 0.05$). Half of the coaches had coached between 1 and 10 All-Americans, whereas the other half had coached over 20 All-Americans. A summary of each coach's level of expertise is presented in Table 1 (see Appendix A).

Procedures

Recruitment. Following approval by the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board (IRB), recruitment emails were sent to all 16 eligible coaches through Qualtrics (see Appendix K). Follow up emails were sent to participants biweekly until a total of four coaches committed to participate (see Appendix M). The email included study information, consent to participate, and a link to a Qualtrics demographic survey (see Appendix L) which collected data

to verify the coach's eligibility of all inclusion criteria. After consent was given, the researcher contacted the participants by email to schedule a date and time for the interview. The process to recruit and interview four coaches took approximately 120 days.

Data collection. Participants engaged in face-to-face, semi-structured interviews. Interviews were conducted by the lead researcher between June and September 2019. Participants chose to meet at locations that were quiet, allowing for flow of conversation and conducive to quality recording. Interviews lasted between 44 and 122 minutes ($M = 83$ minutes) and transcribed verbatim using NVIVO Transcription software. Participants were given a two-week window to review and augment their interview transcript to allow for respondent validation and to clarify any ambiguities in the transcript (Guest et al., 2012), however, no participants asked to make changes in their transcripts.

Interview guide. The interview guide consisted of a framing introduction to be read to participants and a series of probing questions. The interviews began with a vignette, followed by a reading of a job description (see Appendix N). The vignette was written by the lead researcher and validated by two other experts in the field. It was also tested in the pilot interview. The vignette (Miles, 1990) was a hypothetical scenario written to frame subsequent interview questions around the idea of an experienced DI coach giving advice to a coach just beginning his/her DI coaching career. For example, the vignette included the following snippet:

Coach Smith has recently been offered a head coach position at an NCAA DI FBS institution. The coach respects your wisdom as both a soccer coach and a professional and would like to pick your brain about some of the expectations of working in this context. The two of you meet for coffee to discuss some of the 'unwritten' components of a DI head coaching job. You try to think back to a time when you were in Coach Smith's

shoes to remember some of your initial impressions of your first DI head coaching job.

Coach Smith begins the conversation by asking, ‘What is it like working at an NCAA DI FBS university as opposed to other coaching environments?’

The interview guide designed to explore several themes related specifically to the coach’s perspective of their job: unique components of working in a DI organization, primary duties of the job, required knowledge, overarching objectives, processes of achieving objectives, and job challenges. The list of topics to explore were generated from multiple sources including the organizational behavior literature concerning jobs and how people work (Schein, 1990; Schneider & Konz, 1989); existing literature on high-performance coaching (Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995; Readdy et al., 2016; Rynne & Mallett, 2012); and from gaps in the literature about NCAA coaches’ work.

The questions were open-ended and followed with probing questions such as, “Could you tell me more about that?” The second component of the interview guide was the reading of a job description. The job description was a modified job announcement for an NCAA DI FBS head soccer coach (NCAA, 2019b) which included the job responsibilities, minimum qualifications, and preferred qualifications of a candidate (see Appendix O). Coaches were asked to read the job description and then comment on each job responsibility as it related to the realities of their job. For example, the job description listed “Responsible for recruiting highly skilled athletes.” The coach would either agree or disagree with this statement and was probed to elaborate on their response.

Trustworthiness. Within an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm, it is common for the researcher to be the primary instrument for data collection. Additionally, it is considered advantageous when the researcher is similar to the participants, allowing for greater

understanding and interpretation of responses (Charmaz, 2014). However, both the researcher as instrument and the likeness to the study participants can pose potential threats to trustworthiness. According to Poggenpoel and Myburgh, (2003), the research as instrument can be the greatest threat to trustworthiness in qualitative research if adequate time is not spent in preparation for interviewing. Further, it is challenging for researchers who are like study participants, as they can be prone to limiting their curiosities and only discovering what they think they don't know (Chenail, 2011). The researcher was a former collegiate soccer coach, which ran the risk of imposing pre-existing beliefs on participants during the interview process. To account for potential threats to trustworthiness, the researcher practiced interviewing with an NCAA Division II soccer coach and an NCAA DI FBS head volleyball coach, which were recorded and asynchronously reviewed by a faculty member who was an experienced interviewer. This allowed the researcher an opportunity to refine interviewing skills, as well as check for biases or leading questions.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this research was to understand the work of a coach from their own perspective. Utilizing an interpretivist-constructivist lens (Sparkes & Smith, 2014), the present study followed the stages of applied thematic analysis (ATA) to analyze data (Guest et al., 2012) which included: 1) read verbatim transcripts, 2) identify possible themes, 3) compare and contrast themes across transcripts, and an optional fourth step - build theoretical models using constant comparison (2012). Safeguards were taken to ensure that the results reflected the coaches' perspectives, as both the lead researcher and a senior reviewer trained in thematic coding analyzed the data to enhance trustworthiness (Guest et al., 2012). The senior reviewer had experience with qualitative data analysis as well as being familiar with the coaching science

literature. Further she had over 20 years coaching experience in a non-soccer context which provided an informed but revoked review of the data.

Data analysis began after each interview. To protect the anonymity of the interviewees, the pseudonyms of Pat, Finley, Sidney, and Charlie were used. One by one, the lead researcher read through the transcripts multiple times to gain familiarity with the data and then engaged in reflexive journaling to record ideas, assumptions, and initial thoughts (Charmaz, 2014). During this process, initial codes were created by identifying meaning units that represented ideas pertinent to the participants' perspectives of their work. After initial coding of all transcripts, the lead researcher used focused coding to look for summary codes from each participant's dataset (Saldana, 2016). Additionally, analytic memos were written to capture reflections about potential themes and to record ideas about the interviews that can be lost in a reductive approach (Charmaz, 2014). Codes were defined in a codebook but were continuously modified as analysis progressed (Guest et al., 2012). This was an iterative process that required reexamination and reflexive thought until the codes were grouped into lower and higher-order themes. Themes were checked and discussed with the senior reviewer before grouping them into overarching categories. Finally, both the lead researcher and senior reviewer discussed the final descriptions of the categories and themes to maximize how effectively they depicted the participants' perspectives as well as the aim of the research question. It is important to note that the categories were not explicitly preconceived, as data were analyzed across the interview. Theoretically-derived category were created based on the data that emerged. See Table 7 for a complete list of coding frequencies for categorical headings, higher and lower-order themes, and summary codes (Appendix P).

Results

With the research question in mind, the findings of the study revealed five major categories that defined how coaching professionals defined the job tasks associated with being a DI women's soccer coach within an FBS conference, including: 1) DI contextual characteristics, 2) job responsibilities, 3) coaching processes, 4) knowledge requirements, and 5) job challenges. Each category is comprised of higher and lower-order themes that emerged based on the summary codes from the raw data within each interview. An overview of the categories, higher and lower-order themes is presented in Table 2 (see Appendix B).

DI Contextual Characteristics

Participants were asked to share their perceptions of working within a DI FBS environment as opposed to other coaching environments. Responses regarding this question were organized under the category, DI contextual characteristics. In this category, one higher-order theme under the same categorical heading – DI contextual characteristics - included elements within NCAA DI FBS athletic organizations that coaches described as unique to their working environments. Two lower-order themes were generated - resources and pressure to win. Summary codes under resources included operating budgets, athletic scholarships, and human resources (e.g. assistant coaches and athletic support staff). All coaches mentioned the differences in resources compared to other NCAA schools. Coach Pat explained that coaches at the DI level must know how to manage large resources - especially scholarships – so they can plan their yearly needs wisely in order to create consistency in their player roster over time. Two of the four coaches said that resources were at a level that didn't require any fundraising. One coach reported that fundraising was necessary only when there was a desire for a facility upgrade. Two coaches reported fundraising only when they wanted to make an international trip.

Regarding human resources, all coaches mentioned having a coalition of support staff including three assistant coaches - two full-time and one part-time or volunteer. Additionally, all coaches reported having athletic department support staff which included: compliance, business and accounting, sports information and media, athletic training, strength and conditioning, sport psychology, academic advising, nutrition, team operations, and events management personnel.

The next lower-order theme under components unique to DI was pressure to win. This lower-order theme represents data that indicates pressure to win comes from different places for different coaches. Summary codes included internal and external pressure. All four coaches spoke of the internal pressure to win due to their competitive drive. Finley made the statement that women's soccer had a different precedent than revenue sports when it came to winning expectations from administration:

It's more rare that you get fired for your win-loss record in women's soccer than maybe you would be in men's basketball... Now if I go [0 wins - 18 losses] three years in a row, I'll fire myself, you know. So, you don't feel that pressure (Finley).

One out of the four coaches reported that external pressure from administration existed at the DI level and that it was evolving to reflect demands similar to revenue sports.

...I have seen over the last 10 or 12 years pressure from administrations to have a successful program...Looking around the country at the coaching turnover in our sport - in particular, fifteen years ago - you rarely saw a lot of soccer coaches getting fired for just not winning enough. You know it would happen in a few places and those places you kind of knew they were really serious about their programs. But I think now we're seeing it more and more that if in five years or so you don't have it heading in the right direction, you probably need to be kind of preparing yourself (Pat).

Job Responsibilities

The next category, job responsibilities, included responses regarding critical tasks and the ways coaches perceive their work roles. Under this category, two higher-order themes were generated, tasks and objectives.

Tasks. Tasks included three lower-order themes, direct coaching tasks, indirect coaching tasks, and occupational tasks. Direct coaching tasks incorporated the following summary codes: player development and team training. All four coaches spoke about player development as a primary duty. Sidney mentioned that player development was one of the three most important tasks of the job. She referred to team training and session planning during the championship season as a main priority - a *glass ball*. It wasn't something she was willing to delegate – “I always write the training sessions during the season – it's a glass ball...I always have my hand on that, and I'm always driving what we're doing technically and tactically.” Charlie mentioned the amount of time spent on player development during the regular season – “Yeah, I mean it's generally practices and training and schedules and competing because, like I said, that's where you are invested with your players. I would say in a season it's 75 percent [of your time].”

The second lower-order theme under tasks was indirect coaching tasks. These included four summary codes: recruiting, talent identification, red flags, and player management. Each coach spoke about recruiting as a primary task of the job. Three of four coaches spoke about recruiting players that would fit within the existing framework of the team and were talented enough to compete at the DI level. Two coaches said that it was important to be able to identify talent that went beyond the player resume. Pat recognized that finding players required having an eye for talent and an understanding of how the player would fit into the coach's system:

So, you can't just go recruit off of resumes. You have to really have an eye for the talent and understand what you want your team to look like and if that player [can] fit. Now, I think we've had a lot of success over the years finding those players that weren't the most well-known, but we knew they would come in and do a good job and get four years better (Pat).

When asked about the amount of time spent on primary tasks, the participants were unanimous in the view that recruiting the right kids for your program was undoubtedly the area in which most time was spent. Finley mentioned that 50% of the job was recruiting. He said, "I'm always watching and evaluating and making calls trying to find the kids." He commented on the amount of time spent filtering through a large recruiting database and vetting players that were at the top of the list. The term he used for vetting was the summary code, "red flags." Finley spoke in detail about what constituted red flags. In summary, he spoke of observing poor behaviors between recruit and parents, coaches, or officials; and poor behavior displayed to current team while on an official visit. He attributed age and experience to his ability to identify and avoid red flags as illustrated by the following comment: "...when I was younger (I was even more stupid), I would think, 'here's a bad kid. I'll get 'em here, work my magic, and change them...As you get older, you start to realize that doesn't happen'" (Finley).

Three of four coaches mentioned that recruiting was critical to having a good program. Conversely, they also said that a good program helps recruiting. This conundrum was evident with most of the coaches. Pat said, "If I come in here in two or three years and I'm not winning, ...I'm still not going to get those top kids because we're not winning." Finley echoed, "You need good players to have a good program. We need a good program to attract good players." Charlie felt that his season performance could improve with better recruiting. In a posture of self-

reflection, he suggested, “recruiting-wise, I probably haven’t recruited a high enough caliber player to help us win...have we settled for moderately average players when we could’ve been more aggressive for higher prominent players?”

Player management was the final summary code under indirect coaching tasks. All four coaches used frequent meetings to check on player well-being, academic progress, and personal matters. Finley expressed the importance of player management – “I thought the more I knew, the better the soccer coach I was...and you get older, and you start to realize that ...player management is a bigger part of your job.” Three of the four coaches talked about the difficulties of keeping players happy, especially if they weren’t getting a lot of playing time. Two of the coaches spoke about using assistant coaches to help manage players who didn’t play much. Finley said, “I think the bottom group sometimes feel like I don’t care. [They think] what [they’re] doing doesn’t add value to the group. I think our volunteer helps with that.”

Regarding the academic portion of player management, all four coaches alluded to being aware of the athletes’ academic issues, and two of the coaches mentioned that they delegated that portion of the program to their assistant coaches. The participants on the whole believed that player management also included discipline when necessary. Two coaches suggested that conflict resolution was a daily task, but there was a broad sense that athlete discipline was not a common occurrence amongst participants.

The final lower-order theme under tasks was occupational tasks. These included the following summary codes: administration, compliance, budgeting, public relations/media, and university employee-specific tasks. All four coaches noted the enormity of occupational tasks, and these were not highly regarded by the coaches. One coach spoke about email as the predominant administrative task. Pat dedicated his early mornings to answering email. He

expressed, "...I get up early and I get in here early and I find that if I can get those couple hours in in the morning before everybody gets here, I'm not interrupted. I can bang that stuff out."

Most often mentioned were tasks associated with compliance. Pat said, "You have to log in how many hours of practice every week and then every month and then how many days off, and so all of that. You've got to log in your phone calls..." Two coaches expressed that most of their compliance work was delegated to assistants. Finley stated, "...there's just so much compliance paperwork in triplicate. The great thing is you have assistants and my assistants are right there and they're both good on technology." Three of four coaches mentioned that budgeting was a primary occupational task. One coach said that his ability to maintain his budget was part of his annual evaluation. Pat articulated that budgeting scholarships was a vital component of his tasks – "You learn how to manage your scholarship money and your recruiting, so you don't ever lose too much of the core of your team at one time and have to start over." Sidney mimicked those sentiments. She explained that scholarship offerings were not delegated to assistants. All four coaches spoke about public relations as an occupational task. Although there were some negative comments regarding using social media, three coaches reported the necessity of social media for branding and recruiting purposes. One coach said that he felt it was necessary to be present in the community to market the program's brand. Charlie expressed that recruiting and marketing the program was dependent upon being seen in the right circles in the comment below:

You've got to be very visible. They've got to know who you are. You've got to be seen at the top training centers around the area. If I'm not there, my opponents' staff are there.

So, I go out just to be seen in the community (Charlie).

The next summary code under occupational tasks was university employee responsibilities. Two coaches said that they were asked to represent the university to the public.

Both coaches felt this was a result of their consistent athletic success. Sidney said that she didn't have to do much advocating for the athletic department, but she often gave speeches on behalf of the university – "...the president of the university [asks me to speak] ...I do a lot with the university." Sidney also felt that it was her responsibility to serve as a university role model and represent the university at the highest standard.

Objectives. The next high-order theme under the category of job responsibilities was objectives. The two lower-order themes under objectives were: winning and student-athlete experience. Under winning, the summary codes were winning a championship and impact of winning. There was a sense amongst coaches that winning underpinned every objective but the reality of winning a championship was complex. In fact, only one coach had ever won a national championship at the DI level. All four participants agreed that winning a national championship was not their only objective. For example, Sidney said: "... it's unfair and an unrealistic goal because only one program can do that once a year. And it's very complicated and very difficult with everything that goes into it." When asked about coaching objectives, Finley answered, "just get better every day," and Pat said that he strove to establish excellence. For one coach, these alternatives to winning stemmed from an understanding of greater purpose. The comment below illustrates how the coach's philosophical point of view has kept her in the coaching profession a long time.

So, what's important to me - and I think why I've been able to last so long in this business - is it's never been about me. And I think if it's a... if you're motivated for the championships you might as well get out. You know. And I'm talking to myself (Sidney).

The second summary code under winning was impact of winning. This referred to the level of influence within the athletic organization when your team was successful. Charlie said

winning gave him influence in the department. He believed that winning games would allow his vision for the program to be realized and supported with administration. This was illustrated in the following statement:

You can have a lot of great ideas and you can have a lot of great concepts of what you want to do, but ultimately to get people to buy-in - your superiors, your bosses, your players, your staff – you’ve got to have short term successful results. I could have some fantastic long-term ideas, but if I go 0-6, I’m not going to be around long enough to introduce those ideas (Charlie).

The next lower-order theme under objectives was student-athlete experience. Student-athlete experience included the summary codes, maximizing potential and special experiences. Sidney said that she felt it was a huge responsibility to make sure her program was organized, her players were being developed, and that the athletes were having a great experience. Charlie mentioned that he liked to create room in the budget to do things that made the players feel like they were getting an elite experience – “I want [the players] to feel like this was as close to professional soccer as it could be, and there were no shortcuts or cutbacks to prevent them from enjoying the experience.” Finley added that a great experience included treating the players well. This meant that the environment should be positive and safe. Soccer should be a “good part of their day, not a bad part of their day.” He also mentioned that every four years he would take his team on an international trip for a special experience.

Coaching Processes

We now turn to the category, coaching processes. This category encompassed the components that determined how coaches achieved objectives. Two higher-order themes emerged under coaching processes – philosophy and methods.

Philosophy. Philosophy specifically referred to components that provided rationale for decision making. Two lower-order themes emerged from the data: coach leadership philosophy and playing philosophy. For the purposes of this manuscript, only coach leadership philosophy will be discussed. Coach leadership philosophy referred to the head coach's ideas about how to lead players and staff. Summary codes under this theme were leadership style, leading staff, coaching attitudes, and player development. Sidney stated that her philosophy was what drove the standards for the program – "...when you drive the culture it's really what is important to this program and to this family... But, most important, to me and my philosophy. So, I have to drive the philosophies that I stand behind every day." The summary code, leadership style, included several approaches to leadership. For example, Pat was a detailed, micro manager. He spoke about having his hands in every aspect of the program. Finley, on the other hand, had a more relaxed approach to his leadership style, while Charlie's leadership style was very relational. He mentioned approaching his coach-player relationships by looking through the lens of the player. When he made decisions about training sessions, he questioned, "What does the player want? What does the player need?"

Under the summary code, leading staff, coaches spoke about their roles as mentors. Each coach stated that one of their purposes was to mentor staff so they could eventually run their own programs. Sidney said, "Everything I do, I try to give to my assistants...It's really important that I'm a mentor and I'm developing [my assistants] and whoever wants to be a head coach someday." Charlie reiterated Sidney's words: "My responsibility as a head coach is to promote good players but empower coaches to be future head coaches." Pat spoke about his willingness to give his staff some autonomy with training sessions. He held feedback sessions about their coaching performance after practice to hold them accountable. He said, "...you just let them run

with it, and then afterwards, you kind of have this other session...It's like players, we all want to know how we're doing our job" (Pat).

Coaching attitudes was the next summary code listed under coach leadership philosophy. Sidney spoke about how enthusiasm and hard work drove everything. The following quote illustrated that point: "If I don't wake up every day enthusiastic about the program, how do I expect anybody else to?" Charlie spoke about the importance of confidence in his position. It was described as a vital component of a coach's ability to lead a team – "How you portray yourself to the team is crucial [to] their ability to follow you and believe in you." His coaching attitude also mirrored Sidney, as he referred to having high energy, motivation, and preparation to create the optimal learning environment for players.

Coach leadership philosophy also included the summary code, player development. All the participant coaches believed in holistic player development – an approach that included physical development, as well as development of transferable life skills. Pat spoke of the integration of his idea of excellence with holistic player development. He spoke about players moving beyond the collegiate years and felt a responsibility to teach them to be excellent in whichever path they chose in life. Sidney offered a unique thought to player development. Referring specifically to her leadership and communication approach, she changed the idiom *tough love* to *love tough*. This was an intentional change to a former philosophy that no longer worked with current athletes, which was illustrated in the comment below:

I used to tough love first. Now I have to love tough first. I think you have to explain to [the players] why you do what you do and not just say run through that wall. They're going to say, 'but why coach?' Back 10 years ago, they'd just run through the wall (Sidney).

Finley echoed Sidney's response to loving and caring for the athletes. He said, "...I started to realize that it needs to be about [the players]. And I needed to convince them that I cared about them. That's when I did my best." All of the coaches seemed to possess this softer side as a genuine tool to enhance player relationships and to develop trust. Finley alluded to the evolution of his coaching practice, learning how and why to individualize his approach to the players: "Experience teaches you different tools to handle different players different ways...in my younger days, it was kind of one approach fits all...that doesn't work with [players]." Sidney said she used the athletes' goals for her personal motivation to maximize their potential. She spoke about goals that were not just athletically related; they had to do with academic goals, career goals, or anything that would propel the athlete forward in life. Further, she mentioned the importance of having staff that could also fill that role, as some players did not connect with the head coach in the same manner as assistant coaches.

Methods. The next higher-order theme under coaching processes was methods. This included specific tactics employed to achieve coaching objectives. There were two lower-order themes: recruiting methods and building culture. Summary codes under recruiting methods were budgeting scholarships/financial aid, efficiency in recruiting, knowing your niche, international recruits, and building a recruiting network.

All coaches spoke about planning their recruiting two or three seasons ahead, therefore, budgeting scholarships for future needs was mentioned as an important process. Pat spoke of the importance of learning how to use your scholarship money so you could build a team that is good every year. He also alluded to how new coaches often make the mistake of using all of their scholarship money on one recruiting class. Further, Pat said that knowledge of the financial aid

system is very advantageous when maximizing the scholarship budget. He had a wealth of experience with maximizing recruiting dollars with exempt funds, which is illustrated below:

...financial aid options are out there, you know, through federal funding. So, I really became a master of that where I could say 'I'll give you a thousand dollars soccer money, but you're getting ten thousand dollars through financial aid.' And, you know...so, now you've done an eleven-thousand-dollar package, and I had to really learn how to put these pieces together (Pat).

The summary code, efficiency in recruiting, stemmed from the idea of how coaches handled selecting and vetting the large number of interested recruits in their database. Finley spoke about the lack of time coaches had to go and watch every recruit that showed interest.

...it's rare a college coach will just go sit out at a game and just casually find the player. Oh, we don't have time for that...our database, for example, we probably have about a thousand kids when we are [in prime recruiting]. We probably have about 700 to 1000 kids who will have contacted us at some point. We're not going to see 1000 kids in a 14 to 16-month period of time. There's just not enough hours in the day (Finley).

To maintain efficiency, two coaches spoke about knowing which tournaments would have the most players of interest so they could maximize the number of evaluations. Finley explained how he narrowed down his list of recruits following a big recruiting tournament. Then he made decisions about who he would contact. The summary code, knowing your niche, was given to meaning units that made reference to the player's ability to fit within the team culture and the university. Pat said it was important to know your university and know the types of students at the university to help determine proper fit. Finley said that some institutions attracted players that had high academic standards, others attracted players that wanted a family environment,

while other institutions tended to draw students due to their warm climate. He said it was important to “establish a niche and find out what works at that particular type of school” (Finley).

The next summary code under recruiting methods was international recruiting. Pat specifically expressed his recruiting strategy with international recruits. He used international recruiting to bring players in that were not influenced by the winning record of the program. As a new coach in his current position, he spoke about getting wins quickly to build his reputation. He felt that a failing program was unattractive to recruits, so he turned to international recruiting.

The top players had already committed...we're really not going to get the better kids 'til year 2021 or 22. So, we made a conscious decision to look at the best kids that were still available, but to go overseas...We've had to go that route to get our team better quicker...a lot of overseas kids want to come to the states (Pat).

According to Pat, foreign players were less enamored with conference reputation or winning percentages than American players. So, it was worth the time spent forging relationships with international clubs to create a large recruiting pool of foreign national team players that could immediately elevate the program.

Lastly, recruiting methods included the summary code, building a recruiting network. The collegiate coach-club coach relationship was mentioned by three of the participant coaches. Pat advised every young collegiate coach to build rapport with club coaches – “I try to get [my assistants] to develop a network of those club coaches in the areas we're recruiting...because what we're finding is...those club coaches are being paid.” Pat explained that paid coaches were expected to help the kids get recruited so they were eager to work with college coaches. Charlie coached local clubs as a means of staying fresh and informed of local talent – “I like to do club

coaching because you get an eye on what's coming through locally, stay connected with the next level, and the next generation of players.” He also expressed the importance of relationships with club coaches – “...I feel like one of the biggest parts of my job is making sure that players and club directors of coaching... know who we are and what we're about and that we have a high interest level in their players” (Charlie).

The next lower-order theme under methods was building culture. Building culture included the following summary codes: setting standards and creating team buy-in. Building culture was a way of imparting the coach's values and philosophy into the DNA of the team. All four coaches spoke about the culture with the following meaning units: establishing standards, driving the culture, setting the tone, creating total buy-in, and getting everyone on the same page. Sidney thought that it was her responsibility to drive the culture daily. She believed her team culture was cultivated through hard work, enthusiasm, holding staff and players accountable for decisions, striving to improve, commitment, and by being true to her coaching philosophy. Pat held to the point that he drove the culture by pushing his philosophy of excellence. In the following comment, Pat expressed the importance of communicating the vision to the players and staff, so everyone understood expectations:

The kids have to have what I call 'total buy-in.' You have to know what you you're your team to look like and how to get it there. And I have to know how to communicate that to my players. And if I do a good job of that right from the get-go and get them to buy in to the vision, then you've got them.

Charlie spoke about the advantages of building culture:

You've got to really establish the culture you want. The culture will overcome anything. You'll overcome drama; you'll overcome a violation; you'll overcome any sort of misdemeanor...the strength of the culture will help that player grow, the team [to] grow.

Further, Charlie believed the culture should include elite training, honest communication with players, and constant improvement from players and staff. He was adamant about not leaving anything to chance, especially the team dynamics. "I never leave it to chance that even though they are good kids they are going to be good teammates. You can take the best girls, or the best male players and they may never click." One way Pat drove the culture was by just being present at all team-related events, including strength and conditioning sessions. He said it was essential for the players to believe that everything they were doing was important enough for the coach to be there. Finley's culture set the standards for training, academic performance, accountability, and established responsibility. He believed in constant culture reinforcement, as well as time spent instructing freshmen how to become part of the team culture. Finley established culture using a variety of methods. He used the upperclassmen as mentors and paired them with younger players to socialize them into the culture. He also held the leaders responsible for governing the team. If there was an issue with a player, he expected the team to try to handle it before he had to step in. He allowed the players to drive the program but ultimately, he felt responsibility for setting the tone. This was illustrated by the following comment:

But I think the mood that we set is one where we expect our best effort. And as long as we get their best effort, we're happy. So, what that means is the first thing I have to [do is] set the tone. So, my first role is I have to set the tone for it - for the program (Finley).

Knowledge Requirements

The category, knowledge requirements, referred to the various coaching functions and work-specific knowledge required for coaches in the DI context. Knowledge requirements were comprised of two higher order themes: coaching roles and requisite knowledge for DI.

Coaching roles. Coaching roles were those functions assumed by the coach that may or may not involve direct coaching. Two lower-order themes were generated, head coach roles and support staff roles. However, for this manuscript only head coach roles will be discussed. Summary codes related to head coach roles were CEO, parent, and mentor. Each participant coach described themselves as the CEO of their program – “...you’re almost like a CEO of your own company, you know...because you’ve got to have your hands in everything” (Pat). Finley said, “there has to be someone at the top of the tree who’s in charge. Everybody knows who is in charge up my tree. I’m on the top of the tree.” Sidney called herself, “the captain” whereas Finley referred to himself as the “boss” and “enforcer.” Part of the CEO role was to be a visible representative. Charlie described himself as being the face of the program. He commented on being purposely visible in the community to brand the program, whereas Pat did much of his branding work on social media – “I really have gotten heavily involved in Twitter...just trying to get our program out there, get our university out there, get our coaches out there...”

In contrast to the CEO role, coaches also played the role of parent to their players. Each coach said they felt like they had a parental role. Finley jokingly said that sometimes his players loved him and sometimes they hated him – “...sometimes I feel like I’ve got 27 daughters.” Ultimately, the role included connecting with players and ensuring that trust was being established. All coaches expressed that their role was about helping young student-athletes maximize their potential on many levels, whether on the field or in the classroom. Charlie

described himself as a mentor – “These are 18 and 21-year-olds that, hopefully, will trust you...90% [of the job is about] player relationships.” Sidney echoed Charlie’s sentiments. She called her job an “incredible opportunity to be a life coach.”

Requisite knowledge for DI. The next higher order theme under knowledge requirements was requisite knowledge for DI. This theme included the types of knowledge necessary to do the job, specifically, in the NCAA DI FBS context. There were four lower-order themes: professional knowledge, occupational knowledge, interpersonal knowledge, and intrapersonal knowledge. Professional knowledge included the following summary codes: sport science, sport psychology, and training theory. Regarding sport science, two of the four coaches spoke of the need to know about periodization, rest, and recovery. The need for sport psychology knowledge was mentioned by three of the four coaches. Confidence, motivation, communication, and emotional regulation were three areas mentioned in reference to sport psychology. Charlie spoke about having complete confidence in his ability to be an effective coach at this level. He thought it was important for a coach to know how to project confidence to his players – “How you portray yourself to the team is crucial to their ability to follow you and believe in you.” All four coaches spoke about player motivation. Pat said, “find out how to tap into what makes them tick...because you have to have what I call ‘total buy-in’.” Two coaches mentioned the connection between good communication and motivation. Pat said the message should be individualized. Charlie spoke about having three daughters of his own and the importance of communicating differently to each one.

I’m a better coach because I am a parent...I’ve got three daughters and I’ve got to talk to them all differently. One of them I can tell her face-to-face, the other one I’ve got to tell her in the sweetest way possible. Another one, I’m just brutally honest (Charlie).

Finley used his coaching objective, “just get better every day,” as a motivational tool. He believed that if he overshot team objectives, players would get discouraged when they realized they couldn’t accomplish them, and they would stop investing energy. He said, “I genuinely feel if you set yourself up for [failure], the kids today [are] wired differently. They will just say, ‘well we can’t achieve that now, so let’s take all that energy there and put it somewhere else.’” Charlie viewed his primary responsibility as inspiring and motivating players and staff, which he expressed in the following quote:

I’ve got to inspire my players to be better...I’ve got to inspire my staff. I’ve got to be motivated. I’ve got to be high energy. I have got to be excitable because when players arrive every day, they mostly come from class. They are tired...they’ve already gone through a long day. They’re looking at you, as a coach, to be that prominent leader that’s like, ‘it’s soccer; it’s fun; it’s enjoyable; it’s competitive; it’s challenging. I don’t have any other task that I feel is as important as every day, I’ve got to bring it (Charlie).

The last finding relating to sport psychology knowledge was emotional regulation. Charlie and Sidney used emotional regulation to portray a desired attitude. Charlie mentioned always being prepared and having great energy. He felt like his energy could impact player performance.

Therefore, he deliberately showed high energy during practices and games even if he didn’t feel energetic. He said, “When the players arrive, I am upbeat, cheerful, excited, animated, passionate, energetic because they’re gonna live off that.” Sidney was similar. She felt like her enthusiasm drove the culture – “You know, my big thing is enthusiasm gets you places. So, if I don’t wake up every day enthusiastic about the program, how do I expect anybody else to?”

Finley used emotional regulation in a different way. Sometimes he showed emotion deliberately and sometimes he showed restraint. He used these methods of control to motivate or to achieve a

desired response. For example, when he didn't feel like the players were performing to his standards he would, "have a go at them." This meant there would be some level of ridicule to get the players back on track.

Moving on to the next summary code, training theory was discussed by all the coaches. Sidney referred to the level of complexities in writing a training plan with the following quote:

[T]here's a lot that goes in [a training plan] and then just, you know, a piece of paper and YouTube. A great session has to have purpose. It has to be effective and [it] has to be have high performance but high recovery (Sidney).

Pat commented on context-specific training. He expressed the importance of having a strength and conditioning coach that was knowledgeable of soccer fitness. His prior experience with strength and conditioning coaches that were only versed in football made him cautious about who was involved in conditioning his players. He said, "Fortunately the guy we have is all over that, and he is well versed in everything I threw at him about modern trends."

The next lower-order theme was occupational knowledge. Occupational knowledge referred to the types of knowledge outside the sport context. The following summary codes were used under this theme: administration, conflict resolution, human resource management, budgeting and accounting, compliance, recruiting, marketing and branding, and prioritizing tasks. Sidney described herself as a manager of people. She said that hiring staff and conflict resolution were key things to know for DI coaches. She and Pat spoke about knowing how to resolve conflict. Pat said putting out fires was part of his job. Sidney had the same opinion—"You know you can't be afraid of confrontation. ...every day you have to deal with conflict when you deal with human beings...I don't run a dictatorship here, so there's a lot of agreeing to disagree." All four coaches said that administration was part of their job, as well as knowing

about compliance and the rules for recruiting. Charlie said administrative work was the area in which he felt the least prepared.

This was illustrated in the following statement:

I felt like that I was prepared with years of coaching experience, years of coaching different levels, different types of players boys, girls, older, younger, pro-level, playing at a high level. So, it I felt like I built up a coaching resume. What I didn't have [on] this coaching resume was administrative duties that really, I needed to understand - Monday through Friday...who I needed to be seeing or what I needed to be doing and signing off on (Charlie).

Regarding budgeting and accounting, two coaches expressed the need for this to be part of coaching education. Pat spoke about the nuances of budgeting scholarships as being challenging for new coaches to learn on their own. One coach said his budget was part of his annual evaluation. Regarding marketing and branding, all four coaches discussed this as important to their work. Charlie alluded to being conscious of branding in the following comment:

I'll probably go to five or six local clubs to talk about college recruiting the process so getting my face out there getting the schools brand out there, getting our name out there is important. So...I never think at this job you switch off - you switch off, you lose (Charlie).

Prioritizing tasks was the final summary code under occupational knowledge. Sidney described prioritizing tasks as a means to balance the most important things in her work and life with those that were less important. She used the analogy of juggling glass balls and rubber balls. She distinguished which tasks were priority – these were glass balls. Those that were less of a

priority were the rubber balls – ones she was willing to drop. She illustrated that point with the statement below:

It's very hard for me. You know, it's funny. I try to...you know, I have three children at home, too, and then I have to recruit. And again, here goes 'glass balls/rubber balls.' So, I always try to do something for the university once a year and then I have obligations to [X] Athletic Club. So, I'm always trying to balance all that (Sidney).

The next lower theme was interpersonal knowledge. This included the following summary codes: communication, relationships, and trust. Interpersonal knowledge involved the social interactions between coaches, athletes, and support staff. Finley showed the necessity of interpersonal knowledge by the frequency he met with his players. He had a strong conviction about the importance of relationships and trust. He felt like he had to be approachable so players would want to come talk with him. Charlie spoke about the importance of building trusting relationships with his staff. He said that coaches have to know how to trust and delegate in order to get more accomplished and to allow assistants an opportunity to grow.

The last lower-order theme under requisite knowledge for DI was intrapersonal knowledge, which used the summary codes, reflection, understanding purpose, and self-awareness. Pat and Sidney spoke about the use of reflection to assess their coaching knowledge and performance to determine their professional growth needs. All of the participant coaches alluded to their desire to learn more. Finley was reflective of his coaching tenure. He said, "I look back now of me as a younger coach...Oh my god...I'm embarrassed by some of the things I did and said." Yet, this reflective activity allowed coaches to develop wisdom and a sense of greater purpose. Sidney and Finley spoke about understanding purpose. Sidney kept her philosophy player-centered – "It's never about me." She went on to give a statement of purpose

– “It’s the weddings that matter and not the championships,” speaking to the idea of keeping the focus on the players and staff and real life, and less focus on outcomes. Finley echoed that attitude. He expressed that coaches should not get hung up on wins and losses. He was clear about being purposeful in giving the players an overall positive collegiate experience.

Job Challenges

Under this category there was one higher-order theme with the same name: job challenges. Two lower-order themes were generated: coaching challenges and occupational challenges. Coaching challenges produced two summary codes: adapting to Generation Z and recruiting. By far, the biggest coaching challenge stemmed from adapting to Generation Z athletes. Three of four coaches said they had to understand how to coach players that were very different than a decade ago. Pat said that Generation Z players lacked toughness and a competitive drive. He referred to overbearing helicopter parents who contributed to the inability for players to handle conflict and adversity. He suggested that players were less mature than those of prior generations, and there seemed to be a greater need to employ more psychologists for students in and out of a sport context. Because of these traits in Generation Z, Coach Pat found it challenging to recruit players that he wanted, which he expressed below:

The biggest challenge for us in the recruiting process is there are so many good kids that have gone through growing up where they’ve kind of been given so much; they’ve been given everything, and when things didn’t go their way, they weren’t forced to handle those issues themselves. Mom and Dad took care of it (Pat).

Sidney and Finley also spoke about the coaching challenges of Generation Z – “Kids today, they’re different. Players today – male or female – there has to be a why...” (Finley). Sidney

confirmed the need for more explanation required to coach Generation Z players in the following quote:

This generation [is different] than 20 years ago...you have to explain to them why you do what you do and not just say run through that wall. They're going to say, 'but why coach?' Back 10 years ago, they'd just run through the wall (Sidney).

Finley said that new players think about the coach differently. Coach expertise did not guarantee a motivation to perform. He said that new players are motivated when demands were personally beneficial. He explained that coaches had to clarify how the team would benefit from a particular request, but it was just as important that the player personally benefit. Doing things for the good of the team was not a primary motivator.

The age of social media and its impact on Generation Z was also concerning for the participant coaches. Pat said that the current generation was very high on digital communication. Whereas 10 years ago, coaches might receive letters expressing interests from recruits, now it is more about personal web pages, text messaging, and email. Sidney said that players were so distracted by technology and social media that it presented challenges in terms of getting players to focus. Coaching focused was also a challenge as mentioned by one coach:

You recruit players who are two or three years down the road before you even get them. So, in one task you've got one eye on your current season. You've got your eye on the future seasons, and sometimes you never really get to coach the team that you build because you're always on to the next player, the next team, the next era (Charlie).

The second lower-order theme under job challenges was occupational challenges. These referred to non-coaching challenges of the job, which included the following summary codes: work-life balance, and social media. Three coaches mentioned the heavy workload and long

hours of the job. Therefore, one occupational challenge was maintaining a work-life balance.

Two coaches spoke about the impact of their work on the family. Sidney mentioned having kids at home and balancing decisions between work and family. Charlie gave an example of going out to dinner with his spouse and using the salt and pepper shakers and sugar packets to walk through a playing system. After working it out, he asked his wife, “What do you make of this formation?” She said, “Just put the sugar away. Put the salt away.” He said, “You never switch off” (Charlie).

Finally, the last summary code was social media. Pat felt that social media presented a challenge for coaches. He said it was necessary to use social media for sending messages and branding the program, but it was hard to see critical feedback from the public – “People are free to tell you how good you are, how bad you are...what kind of an idiot you are for making this decision or that decision. So, you have to have an understanding of how to cope with that” (Pat).

Conclusion

In summary, the present study uncovered what coaches thought about their professional work. There were many aspects of their job that were germane to the overall coaching profession (e.g. direct coaching tasks), but the level of resources, the occupational components of their job, the time spent recruiting, and the mixed coaching roles, (particularly the role of CEO), indicated that the job within the NCAA DI FBS context was highly complex. The nuances of the coaching occupation within this context necessitated more than professional knowledge (e.g. technical/tactical, physical, psychological) but needed an alchemy of knowledge including human resource management, leadership, conflict resolution, accounting, and interpersonal communication, to name a few. Passion and enthusiasm for the work was not lost on this coaching sample. Despite job challenges, coaches spoke positively about their work experiences

and felt a great sense of purpose. In the words of Pat, “I just have never really looked at it as a job because I'm really passionate about what I do, and I just love doing it.”

Discussion

This research was designed to explore the professional work of NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coaches. Although it may be disputed that coaches in this context are also high-performance coaches, there are many similarities between high-performance coaches and the present sample (e.g. performing in an elite atmosphere; coaching elite athletes; access to advanced training technologies; working and managing resources and support personnel; and having demands to win) (Mallett, Rynne, & Dickens, 2013). Therefore, the findings in this study were often compared to the literature around high-performance coaches. It has been well established that the work of high-performance coaches is complex and difficult to fully define (Bowes & Jones, 2006; Jones et al., 2003; Readdy et al., 2016). This research was not immune to the difficulties of defining and organizing themes into tidy categories, as the nature of coaching is social, interactive, and dynamic (Jones, 2006), which hardly lent itself to being compartmentalized. However, as we attempt to move forward with the professionalization of coaching, the ways in which we understand the profession begin with teasing out and classifying the work of the professionals (Lyle, 2002). Results produced five broad categories: DI contextual characteristics, job responsibilities, coaching processes, knowledge requirements, and job challenges. These will be examined and discussed in the aggregate.

Lyle (2002) said that the role and expectations of the coach are impacted by the organizational context. NCAA DI FBS athletic programs are at the top of the financial food chain across all subdivisions. Thanks to the amount of million-dollar revenue produced by television contracts (Statista, 2020b), as well as merchandise and ticket sales, sport programs in

this context are funded with vast financial and human resources. Some authors have suggested that winning can be hindered by constraints such as poor training facilities or a lack of financial resources (Jenny, 2007). NCAA DI programs invest in winning by offering substantial financial and human resources to its sport programs. Coaches in less-resourced university programs have fundraising responsibilities to keep operating budgets in the black or to make improvements to the program that might entice recruits (Vallée & Bloom, 2005), but this was not the case with current study participants. The findings from the present study showed that coaches were aware of their resources in comparison to other subdivisions. They also reported the number of support personnel including assistant coaches, strength and conditioning coaches, sport psychologists, athletic trainers, nutritionists, academic advisors, sports and information/social media directors, and events personnel that all contributed to the success of the program.

To Lyle's (2002) earlier point, the DI FBS organization provides the financial and personnel support, which dictates the coach's role. Coaches in the current study perceived to be managers of these resources, serving the role of CEO. They believed to be the leaders, visionaries, and creators of their own team culture. This required a range of knowledge and skills such as marketing and branding, public relations, leadership, interpersonal communication, and human resource management. Similar findings were reported by Rynne and Mallett (2012) who studied the tasks and responsibilities of high-performance coaches outside the NCAA context. They reported that coaches must be skilled in operational programming, as well as people management - managing egos, personalities, and conflict resolution. Further, the participants reported the need for accounting and budgeting skills, as well as knowledge of NCAA compliance and the federal financial aid system. Rynne and Mallett (2012) echoed these necessary proficiencies in a high-performance sport context. Coaches must know how to budget

resources and allow time for paperwork, which were deemed necessary components of the job, although had limited direct impact on the performance of athletes.

Maximizing athlete performance is the area of sport coaching that is most germane to the work of a coach. Coaches spoke about the immense level of attention given to player development and training preparation. It was reported that specific professional knowledge was required to do these tasks well. Naturally, knowledge of the sport, itself, is most critical, but the specific physical performance training knowledge, psychology, and tactical expertise were also discussed in this sample of coaches. Managing both the occupational and direct coaching components of the job is unique to this profession. Fletcher and Arnold (2011) penned the term “performance managers” which seemed to describe coaches in this context. They are responsible for managing logistics that allow performance to occur (2011). Additionally, performance managers support and guide individuals and teams to maximize performance (Thorpe & Holloway, 2008).

A key finding related to performance management were the indirect tasks of the coaching job. Coaches in the study reported the incessant recruiting demands, as well as the importance of building a culture that guided the program. Participants said that building culture required communicating the vision and implementing social structures and processes that were accepted and adopted by the staff and team. These structures were necessary to establish player and staff buy-in or commitment to the coach’s vision, playing philosophy, and behavioral expectations for athletic and academic performance. Yukelson and Rose (2014) studied a highly successful DI volleyball coach who reported that getting players to buy into the team plan or culture was one of the key attributes to success. Building culture requires interpersonal knowledge to use communication skills, motivation, and social intelligence. Other writings have explored the

interpersonal elements within the coaching process and used the term “social orchestration” (Jones & Wallace, 2005; Santos et al., 2013) to describe how coaches effectively get players to commit to their vision. Much like the coaches in the present study, orchestration requires strategic interactions and interpersonal influences, as well as iterative planning, observation, evaluation, and reactions to situations (Jones, 2006; Santos et al., 2013), which are skills that encompass both interpersonal and occupational knowledge. Prior research about building culture in high-performance sport (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Vallée & Bloom, 2016) agreed with these sentiments. Mallett & Lara-Bercial (2016) found that serial winning coaches established and communicated a vision; selected and developed the right people to achieve the vision, utilized interpersonal strategies to create buy-in, and facilitated these processes (2016).

Of note in the present study is the importance placed on the process of recruitment by the participants as a key theme associated with the job of being a DI FBS women’s soccer coach. The emphasis was on the rules and process of recruitment, not on talent identification, and while numerous articles exist on the identification of soccer talent among development athletes (e.g. Collins & MacNamara, 2019; Larkin & Reeves, 2018), very few scholars have given any insight on the recruiting processes or the skills involved in the actual recruitment of collegiate athletes. One possible explanation is that NCAA DI coaches answer to the NCAA regarding recruiting practices. Coaches reported the considerable amount of paperwork required to meet NCAA compliance. They are required to leave a recruiting thumbprint that is well-documented. Some coaches may not be comfortable divulging details about recruiting practices as it could inadvertently leave them vulnerable to NCAA sanction. Fortunately, participants were willing to provide details about their recruiting methods.

From their single case study, Yukelson & Rose (2014) reported the importance of recruiting players that fit the program's standards, but there was no emphasis on their process. Respondents in the present study spoke at length about the task of recruiting, and several commonalities to their strategies were found such as, knowing your coaching philosophy, the style you want to play, and the types of kids that fit within the coach's framework were critical foundational pieces of the skillful recruiter. Further, coaches spoke about recruiting players on more than just their resume. In fact, most coaches mentioned they recruited athletes that were not highly sought after by competing programs. They looked for intangible qualities like work ethic, leadership ability, competitive drive, and the potential to get better. This was also the case with serial winning coaches studied by Mallett and Lara-Bercial (2016). Player selection considered the fit with existing team culture, as well as ensuring new players would not upset the dynamics of the team or possess conflicting values to those of the coach (2016). Some of the coaches spoke about players that they avoided regardless of talent level. This took a unique ability to notice behaviors and nuances of character (also called "red flags"). Santos and colleagues (2013) explained that coaches in their sample had the ability to notice situational details that informed their decisions. This type of noticing is an understudied concept, but it is sometimes referred to as coach's tacit knowledge (2013).

The next commonality was the need for efficiency in recruiting. Coaches in the study alluded to spending at least 50% of their time on recruiting-related tasks. NCAA DI FBS schools carry an elite status, which draws attention from many recruits. One coach reported having a database of 800+ recruits, many of which were of similar talent, making the sifting process difficult. One method of filtering included developing relationships with club coaches that had a reputation for producing elite players. Much time was spent discussing players with club coaches

to eliminate needless time scouting players in person. Therefore, the club coach-college coach relationship was vital to the recruiting strategy. The second aspect of efficient recruiting involved attending recruiting tournaments that had many prospects at the same location. Instead of watching one or two players in one game, a coach could watch a hundred players in several games.

An interesting finding was some of the logic behind recruiting decisions. In Pat's situation, getting more players for less money was a clever and necessary tactic for any coach rebuilding a program. He was a master at the financial aid system and understood the types of grants and scholarships that would not count against his scholarship equivalencies – a very important piece of knowledge for collegiate coaches. This allowed him to maximize his scholarship budget and bring in more players to fill his roster. Lastly, coaches looked at international recruits. Within NCAA women's soccer, international recruiting is growing. Between 2013 and 2018, the number of international female soccer players in DI increased by 45% (NCAA, 2019a). All coaches in the study had international recruits, although only Pat spoke about it for explicit reasons. He was drawn to international players for his program because he believed they didn't care as much about the gravitas of playing for programs with elite reputations. They just wanted to play and go to school in the United States. Therefore, it was a strategy for getting wins quickly.

Shifting attention to the challenges of DI FBS work, coaches in the present study revealed that one of their biggest challenges was communicating and managing Generation Z athletes. High-performance coaching requires the ability to communicate effectively and build personal rapport with players and staff (Mallett & Côté, 2006), yet little is known about how coaches adapt to generations. Recent work confirmed the emerging trends of Generation Z

athletes and the challenges faced by collegiate coaches (Elliott & McCullick, 2018; Gould, Nalepa, & Mignano, 2020). Gould and colleagues (2020) reported characteristics of Generation Z athletes, challenges coaches faced, and strategies used to overcome obstacles. Their findings agreed with the reported challenges from study participants. Coaches described a lack of competitive drive, work ethic, and grit, as well as motivational differences compared to prior generations. However, coaches in the present study also found ways to adapt to Generation Z despite the generational differences. Sidney discovered that she needed to change the mantra of “tough love” to “love tough,” suggesting that players needed the elements of care and connection before they would commit.

Overall, the findings in this study addressed the general working environment, the tasks and objectives of a DI FBS women’s soccer coach, and the knowledge requirements that some perceive to be necessary to perform in this coaching context. These findings, while preliminary, agree with other literature about the demands of high-performance coaching regarding the complexity of knowledge, the role of manager or CEO, and the challenges of relating to future generations (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Gould et al., 2020; Humphreys et al., 2016). Lastly, new discoveries related to college recruiting processes were reported within this writing.

Limitations

While this study had merits, including gaining coveted access to a very busy population of coaches and addressing the gaps of literature regarding the professional work of coaches in NCAA DI FBS athletic organizations, there were several limitations to consider. With a sample size of four participants, and only representing one geographical location in the United States, it isn’t possible to make generalities to the greater DI coaching population. However, it was an exploratory study to lay some groundwork to this understudied coaching context. Further, the

findings from these collegiate coaches may differ across conferences and/or NCAA subdivisions. Secondly, the lack of prior research studies around the professional work of NCAA DI coaches limited the foundation of understanding about this population and the ability to make theoretical comparisons. Next, work analysis is typically done by gathering data using multiple methods including interviews and systematic observations (Gore & McAndrew, 2008), and often from several different perspectives. In this case, greater understanding of the professional work could have improved by adding interviews from athletic directors, university presidents, assistant coaches, and/or athletes. Finally, access to this population was difficult. Coaches reported receiving numerous participant requests for which they did not have the time. Adding to the difficulty of access was the time of year data was collected. During the summer of 2019, the Women's World Cup was being held in France, and several coaches attended the event, delaying data collection.

Implications and Future Research

Considering the professionalization movement, coach educators and developers must continue to contribute to knowledge transfer from research to practice. This study was the first to take into account the full scope of work of the DI FBS soccer coach. This presented an exciting opportunity to lay some groundwork about the complexities of coaching in a DI organization and to present preliminary findings that could be a launching pad to more research about collegiate coaches.

The exploratory nature of this study coupled with the broad research question produced results that were expansive in scope. The future research possibilities are endless. First, considering the limitations of the study, it would be beneficial to include a larger sample to produce results that were generalizable. Second, including multiple perspectives in data

collection could increase the validity of findings. Next, a more systematic job task analysis with both interviews and observations could contribute to sport management literature that is void of this line of work. Finally, regarding the difficulties of recruiting this population of coaches, researchers should consider two things. First, avoid recruiting in the summer and fall as coaches are less present on campus during the summer and become extremely busy beginning in August preparing for the upcoming season through fall. Second, although email seems to be the most common method of communicating a research request, participants said that they were constantly inundated with email of such requests. Therefore, communicating via telephone might be a more personal approach to recruiting in which coaches are more likely to participate. Last, recruiting could benefit from snowball sampling, as coaches who value their experience might enlist their relational connections to help the researcher.

Learning more about the coach and their perspectives about their work can be valuable to novice coaches, coach developers, and athletic directors. Although this study had a small sample of expert coaches, the findings may be useful to novice coaches or even pre-novice coaches who desire a career in collegiate coaching as well as to the coach developers and coaching education programs supporting coach preparation. Coach developers need to know the context-specific pieces of the job to create relevant professional development opportunities, while athletic directors need to understand what skills and knowledge are necessary to do the job in order to make better hiring decisions. Poor hires are demoralizing and expensive; neither are good for the athletic organization. Further, from a leadership perspective, athletic directors could benefit from a greater understanding of their staff so they can learn the best ways to support them. Coaches have a strong desire to learn and grow. Support from the leadership in this regard is not only advantageous to the coach, but to the athletes and the organization.

References

- Abraham, A., Collins, D. & Martindale, R. (2006). The coaching schematic: Validation through expert coach consensus, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(6), 549-564. doi: 10.1080/02640410500189173
- Barber, H., & Eckrich, J. (1998). Methods and criteria employed in the evaluation of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 301-322. doi: 10.1123/jsm.12.4.301
- Becker, A. J. (2009). It's not what they do, it's how they do it: Athlete experiences of great coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(1), 93-119. doi: 10.1260/1747-9541.4.1.93
- Becker, A. J. & Wrisberg, C. A. (2008). Effective coaching in action: Observations of legendary collegiate basketball coach Pat Summit. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22, 197-211. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.22.2.197>
- Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. (1998). Text analysis. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in US higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14(2), 105-132. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.14.2.105>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193-206.
- Bloom, G. (2002). Coaching demands and responsibilities of expert coaches. *Psychological Foundations of Sport*, 2, 438-465.

- Bowes, I., & Jones, R. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 235 - 245. doi: 10.1123/tsp.20.2.235
- Campbell, R., & Strong, P. (2012, December 5). Agent says 'double standard' puts college coaches in a no-win situation. Retrieved from <http://www.cbssports.com/collegefootball/story/21277519>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999). *Human Resource Management in Sport and Recreation*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the Investigator: Strategies for Addressing Instrumentation and Researcher Bias Concerns in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(1), 255-262. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss1/16>
- Collins, D., & MacNamara, Á. (2019). From talent identification to talent development: An overview and critique. In M. H. Anshel, T. A. Petrie, & J. A. Steinfeldt (Eds.), *APA Handbooks in Psychology Series. APA Handbook of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 1, Sport Psychology* (p. 111–128). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000123-007>
- Cooper, D. & Allen, J. B. (2017). The coaching process of the expert coach: A coach led approach. *Sport Coaching Review*, 1-29. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2017.1361168
- Cooper, C., & Weight, E. (2011). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 74-89.
- Côté, J. (2006). The development of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 1(3), 217-222. doi: 10.1260/174795406778604609

Côté, J. & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise.

International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching, 4(3), 307 - 323. doi:

10.1260/174795409789623892

Côté, J., Salmela, J., & Russell, S. (1995). The knowledge of high-performance gymnastic coaches: methodological framework. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 65-75.

Côté, J., Salmela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A. & Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 1-17. doi: 10.1123/jsep.17.1.1

Cunningham, G. B., & Dixon, M. A. (2003). New perspectives concerning performance appraisals of intercollegiate coaches. *Quest*, 55(2), 177-192.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2003.10491798>

Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, 55, 215-230. doi: 10.10/00336297.2003.10491800

Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2007). Work–family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(3), 377-406. doi: 10.1123/jsm.21.3.377

Elliott, J. M., & McCullick, B. (2018). Exceptional adaptability in collegiate coaching. *Sport Coaching Review*. doi: 10.1080/216-40629.2018.1480735

Erickson, K., Côté, J., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2007). Sport experiences, milestones, and educational activities associated with high-performance coaches' development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21(3), 302-316. doi: 10.1123/tsp.21.3.302

- Fletcher, D. & Arnold, R. (2011). A qualitative study of performance leadership and management in elite sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23, 223 - 242. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2011.559184
- Gallimore, R. & Tharp, R. (2004). What a coach can teach a teacher, 1975 – 2004: Reflections and reanalysis of John Wooden's teaching practices. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 119 – 137. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.18.2.119>
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. London: Weidenfield & Nicolson.
- Gould, D., Nalepa, J. & Mignano, M. (2020). Coaching Generation Z Athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 32, 104-120. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2019.1581856
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://methods.sagepub.com/book/applied-thematic-analysis>.
<http://dxdoi.org/10.4.135/9781483384436>
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of management-espoused organizational cultural control. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(5), 437-445.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.03.002>
- Harvey, S., Voelker, D. K., Cope, E., & Dieffenbach, K. (2017). Navigating the leadership labyrinth: barriers and supports of a woman collegiate coach in a 20-year leadership role. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-18. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2017.1353232
- International Council for Coaching Excellence (2013). *International Sport Coaching Framework* (v1.2). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Jenny, S. (2007). Coaching effectiveness in NCAA D-1 and II distance running. *Track Coach*, 181, 5787 - 5794.

- Jones, R. L. (Ed.). (2006). *The Sports Coach as Educator: Re-conceptualising Sports Coaching*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, R. L., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 8(2), 213-229. doi: 10.1080/13573320309254
- Jones, R. L., & Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: Coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10, 119-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332052000308792>
- Larkin, P., & Reeves, M. J. (2018). Junior-elite football: time to re-position talent identification? *Soccer & Society*, 19(8), 1183-1192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14660970.2018.1432389>
- Lawler, E. E. (1996). *From the Ground Up: Six Principles For Building the New Logic Corporation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches' behavior*. London: Routledge.
- Mallett, C. J., & Côté, J. (2006). Beyond winning and losing: Guidelines for evaluating high performance coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 213-221. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.20.2.213>
- Mallett, C. J., & Lara-Bercial, S. (2016). Serial winning coaches: people, vision, and environment. In *Sport and Exercise Psychology Research*, (pp. 289-322). <https://doi.org/10.1016/8978-0-12-803634-1.00014-5>
- Miles, M. B. (1990). New methods for qualitative data collection and analysis: vignettes and pre-structured cases. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3, 37-51.

Poggenpoel, M., & Myburgh, C. (2003). The researcher as research instrument in educational research: A possible threat to trustworthiness? (A: research_instrument). *Education*, 124(2), 418-423.

NCAA (2019a). International student-athlete participation. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/international-student-athlete-participation>

NCAA (2019b). The marketplace: Careers in collegiate athletics. Retrieved from <https://ncaamarket.ncaa.org/jobs>

Pastore, D. L., Inglis, S., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Retention factors in coaching and athletic management: differences by gender, position, and geographic location. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 20(4), 427-441.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019372396020004005>

Purdy, L., & Potrac, P. (2016). Am I just not good enough? The creation, development and questioning of a high performance coaching identity. *Sport, Education and Society*, 21(5), 778-795. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2014.941795>

Readdy, T., Zakrajsek, R., & Raabe, J. (2016). Real-world experiences of the coaching pathos: Orchestration of NCAA Division I Sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 30(2), 167-178.

<https://doi.org/10.1123.tsp.2015.0054>

Rocha, C. M., & Chelladurai, P. (2011). Relationship between organizational support and performance of college coaches: A mediational model. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(3), 301-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2011.577793>

Rynne, S. B., & Mallett, C. J. (2012). Understanding the work and learning of high performance

- coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 17(5), 507-523. doi:
10.1080/17408989.2011.621119
- Rynne, S. B., Mallett, C. J., & Rabjohns, M. W. O. (2017). High performance coaching: Demands and development. In R. Thelwell, C. Harwood, & I. Greenlees (Eds.), *The Psychology of Sports Coaching: Research and Practice* (pp. 114-126). Abingdon, Oxon, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Santos, S., Jones, R. L., & Mesquita, I. (2013). Do coaches orchestrate? The working practices of elite Portuguese coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84, 1-10. doi:
10.1080/02701367.2013.784722
- Saury, J. & Durand, M. (1998). Practical knowledge in expert coaches: On-site study of coaching in sailing. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69(3), 254 - 266. doi:
10.1080/02701367.1998.10607692
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109 – 119.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B., & Knoz, A. M. (1989). Strategic job analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 28, 51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930280104>
- Silva, J. M. (2006). Psychological aspects of competition: An interview with Anson Dorrance head women's soccer coach at the University of North Carolina. *Journal of Excellence*, 11, 88-102.

- Sparkes, A.C., & Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health: From Process to Product*. New York: Routledge
- Statista (2020). Number of participants in U.S. high school soccer from 2009/10 to 2018/19. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/267963/participation-in-us-high-school-soccer/>
- Statista (2020b). Revenue of the NCAA from television broadcast payments and licensing rights from 2010 to 2024. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/219608/ncaa-revenue-from-television-rights-agreement/>
- Stoszkowski, J., & Collins, D. (2012). Communities of practice, social learning and networks: Exploiting the social side of coach development. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1 -16. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2012.692671
- Thornberg, R. & Charmaz, K. (2014). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. In U. Flick, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis* (pp. 153-169). London: Sage Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781446282243.n11
- Thorpe, R., & Holloway, J. (2008). Viewing performance. In *Performance Management* (pp. 249-258). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- United States Department of Education (2018). Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (EADA). Retrieved from <https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/>
- Vallée, C. N., & Bloom, G. A., (2005). Building a successful university program: Key and common elements of expert coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17, 179 - 196. doi: 10.1080/10413200591010021

Vallée, C. N., & Bloom, G. A. (2016). Four keys to building a championship culture.

International Sport Coaching Journal, 3(2), 170-177. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2016-0010>

Weight, E. A., Cooper, C., & Popp, N. K. (2015). The coach-educator: NCAA Division I coach perspectives about an integrated university organizational structure. *Journal of Sports Management*, 29, 510 - 522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2014-0006>

Yukelson, D., & Rose, R. (2014). The psychology of ongoing excellence: An NCAA coach's perspective on winning consecutive multiple national championships. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5, 44-58. doi: 10.1080/21520704.2013.866604

APPENDIX A

Table 1

Participant Expert Criteria Summary

	Years coaching DI	Years coaching FBS	Approx. winning %	All-Americans
Coach 1	20+	20+	.70	20+
Coach 2	16-20	16-20	.64	6-10
Coach 3	20+	20+	.73	20+
Coach 4	10-15	5-10	.60	1-5

APPENDIX B

Table 2

Categories and Themes: Professional Work of NCAA DI FBS Coaches

CATEGORY	HIGHER-ORDER THEME	LOWER-ORDER THEME
DI Contextual Characteristics	DI contextual characteristics	Resources Pressure to win
Job Responsibilities	Tasks	Direct coaching tasks Indirect coaching tasks Occupational tasks
	Objectives	Winning Student-athlete experience
Coaching Processes	Philosophy	Coach leadership philosophy Playing philosophy
	Methods	Recruiting methods Building culture
Knowledge Requirements	Coaching roles	Head coach roles Support staff roles
	Requisite knowledge for DI	Professional knowledge Occupational knowledge Interpersonal knowledge Intrapersonal knowledge
Job Challenges	Job challenges	Coaching challenges Occupational challenges

APPENDIX C

Chapter 1

Introduction

Sport coaching, as a vocation, is arguably one of the most prolific occupations in the world (Duffy et al., 2011). The number of paid sport coaches in the United States is near 276,000 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018) with an estimated 6.5 million youth sport coaches, both paid and volunteer (Aspen Institute Project Play, 2018). The impact that coaches can have on society is multifaceted, ranging from generating economic activity in a community to serving as advocates for advancing physical activity in children. Further, few vocations have the same level of influence (both positive and negative) on a child's mental, physical, and social development as a coach. Yet, societal stigmas label sport coaches as "mere teachers of games," which not only marginalizes the level of knowledge, skill, and ability it takes to be an effective coach, but also fails to value coaches as professionals.

In recent years, coaching practitioners and academics have engaged in the discussion about the professionalization of coaching (Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2009). It is suggested that coaches aspire to legitimize the field and be perceived as professionals in the same manner as traditional professions like teachers, lawyers, or medical professionals (Lyle, 2002). However, unlike coaching, traditional professions have a common tract toward licensure. They become bonafide when its candidates' knowledge and skills have been scrutinized and evaluated according to standards set by a professional organization - ensuring that there is a license before the individual can practice. In addition to a standardized body of knowledge, it is suggested that professional practice should include a professional authority, community sanction, and a regulative code of ethics (Chelladurai, 1999).

Resolving the problem of the definitive components of a profession is an ambitious task that has been attempted by many authors (e.g. Bayles, 1988; Chelladurai, 1999; Rodolfa et al., 2005; Williams, 1998), but has yet to be established. Regardless of a proper definition, Lyle (2002) argued that “coaching cannot become a profession until we decide on (and defend) that which makes us different, that which makes us professional” (p. 308). Therefore, advancing knowledge about specific coaching contexts could inform professional coach education and development, thus, mobilizing the professionalization movement.

Of course, due to the predominantly volunteer nature of sport coaching, it can be argued that it is inappropriate to compare traditional professions with coaches (Taylor & Garret, 2010), suggesting that professions are more easily recognized when compensation earns a living wage. Under that logic, there is a population of coaches that work in the field as its primary vocation. In the United States, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), collectively, employed 26,863 head coaches and 56,750 assistant coaches in 2018 (U.S Department of Education, 2018). Further, in NCAA Division I (all subdivisions) the median cumulative salary distributed to all head coaches per institution was \$1,924,043.00 (2018). This number assumes that head coaches of Division I sports, on average, earn six-figure salaries. It then stands to reason that NCAA head coaches are professionals and should be subject to the mores of other professions. However, standards of knowledge, pathway to licensure, ethical behavior, accountability oversight, and tracts for professional development are not governed by a central sport ministry in the United States, making the adoption of professional standards extremely difficult.

Another barrier to professionalization of coaching is the lack of consensus as to what knowledge is required of coaches, and thus, what should be taught within coaching education. Despite decades of research, coaching academics and practitioners are still in the beginning

stages of deciding on the statutes of knowledge and acceptable behavior of sport coaches, especially as it pertains to context-specific coaching. Still, coaching scientists have advanced what is known about the components of the coaching profession. A seminal contribution was made by Côté & Gilbert (2009) with their integrated definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. The study revealed that coaching requires a holistic approach including three knowledge types: professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal, while considering athlete outcomes (competence, confidence, connection, and character), as well as coaching context (2009). Professional knowledge includes knowledge about the sport, athletes, sport science, coaching theory, pedagogy, and foundational skills (ICCE, 2013). Further, coaches must be proficient in instruction, motivation, planning and organization (Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995). As the coaching pathway becomes more advanced, coaches are expected to be knowledgeable in recruiting and scouting, planning, compliance, budgeting, media relations, external relations, problem-solving, and sport marketing (Barber & Eckrich, 1998; Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995; Schempp & McCullick, 2010).

High-performance coaches, (those that coach elite-level athletes), are expected to be equipped with the components of professional knowledge, as well as building relationships, emotional regulation, intuition, or *professional know-how* (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2003; Santos, Jones, & Mesquita, 2013). This type of knowledge is necessary to read the needs of the team or respond to nonverbal messages given by the athletes. Studies of the interpersonal nature of coaching are well documented (Gilbert & Côté, 2013; Readdy et al., 2016; Santos et al., 2013), as well as the notion that coaching is a complex system comprised of many agents and social processes that are random, chaotic, and constantly evolving (Bowes & Jones, 2006). A high-performance coach is a master at orchestrating the complexities of personnel, goal

achievement, motivation, and conflict resolution (Readdy, et al., 2016; Santos et al, 2013).

Recent literature of NCAA coaches explored the interpersonal elements of coaching and found that for coaches to effectively guide athletes toward desired outcomes, they must create a connection, establish trust, and show empathy before exuding any influence over athlete behavior (Readdy et al., 2016).

The interpersonal element of coaching knowledge is not traditionally covered in the classroom, although it is arguably the most important piece of athlete motivation and stakeholder buy-in. Becker (2009) confirmed this fact in a study of elite-level athletes' perspectives of great coaching. Athletes found their relationships to be one of the most significant aspects of their overall athletic experience. Building relationships that result in trust and motivation to perform is a crucial skill of a high-performance coach. It is not a linear process, however, and each coach approaches this component of coaching in a non-scripted way. In a life-story study of a professional soccer coach (Jones et al., 2003), the coach described the importance of supporting the athlete and creating positive relationships in order to push the athlete to the highest levels of performance. Santos et al. (2013) explored how elite coaches exhibit the process of social orchestration to steer athletes toward desired objectives. It was reported that coaches use social tactical skills like impression management to always appear in control, noticing situational details to inform action, and controlling the competitive environment to create desired responses (e.g., comfort, insecurity, challenge, confidence, etc.) (2013).

In recent work about high-performance coaches, researchers explored the practices of serial winning coaches (SWCs) to gain insight of the necessary competencies and skill requirements, as well as the interpersonal and intrapersonal underpinnings of their coaching processes (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016). SWCs were found to be effective communicators,

teachers, managers, and planners. Further, they were very relational – a quality necessary to build a coalition of people aligned with the vision of the program. SWCs created the work environment that cultivated culture and norms, as well as provided stability for the organization. They were described as leaders that saw the big picture and could articulate it to external and internal stakeholders. SWCs had a high level of self-awareness and intrapersonal knowledge that stemmed from advanced emotional intelligence (2016). Further, SWCs had superior cognitive and decision-making skills that were developed through reflective activity (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Gilbert & Côté, 2013).

Although there is a growing body of research about the complexity of knowledge, skill, and processes of high-performance coaches, questions remain about context-specific coaching. Particularly within NCAA Division I, very little is known about the professional work of the coach. Considering professional development for NCAA coaches, it seems pertinent to be specific to the organizational context. Previous research about NCAA coaches (Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; Langsdorf, 1976; Wrisberg, 1990) is both limited and outdated and may not apply to the current Division I coach. NCAA Division I coaches operate within a commercial enterprise, where the expectations of winning are highly influenced by the level of financial investment from the institution and its external stakeholders (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). Adding to its complexity, Division I coaches also work in an educational setting, where student-athletes are required to fulfill academic obligations imposed by the university and the NCAA. Both the duality of mission and the high-pressure nature of collegiate coaching makes the work of a Division I coach unique and unlike any other profession. Dixon and Bruening (2007) described college coaching as a “multifaceted, high-paced setting full of practices, recruiting, off-season workouts, administrative responsibilities, and teaching duties [that] has created an environment

in which only those willing to work 12 hour days, six days a week, for 50 weeks a year can thrive (p.384).

Rarely studied in literature is the organizational context or the workplace culture of the NCAA Division I coach. Previous studies have addressed the athletic culture and how it relates to work-life balance and retention/attrition of coaches (Pastore, Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1996), but there is no research that describes the workplace culture in a non-critical tone with the intention of simply understanding the work of a coach. Beyer and Hannah (2000) studied the cultural origins of intercollegiate athletics. Using Parsons' (1951) classic analysis of social systems, the authors described both positive and negative cultural consequences of athletic organizations. For example, intercollegiate athletics promote a sense of belonging and team affiliation, but also create elitism and separatism from the academic institution. In addition, university athletics contribute to institutional branding and generation of revenue yet are susceptible to losing focus of the educational mission (Beyer and Hannah, 2000).

Within management literature, it has been reported that the organizational culture mediates the performance of employees (Harris & Ogbonna, 2011), however it is unknown how working within an NCAA DI FBS environment impacts the coaching process. No study to date has examined how coaches navigate their work within this specific context, or if there are cultural influences or compulsory demands of working within the athletic department that affect coaching decisions. Some research has hinted at describing the professional work of NCAA Division I coaches, but a number of questions remain. Ready et al. (2016) studied NCAA head coaches (all divisions) to determine factors that describe the complexity of the coaching process. They concluded that NCAA coaches use similar processes as other high-performance coaches to achieve objectives (e.g., build relationships, orchestrate, staff empowerment,

emotional/behavioral regulation, etc.), but the context-specific elements of working as a coach within an NCAA member institution were not addressed. Similarly, Elliott and McCullick (2018) studied exceptional adaptability of NCAA coaches to enhance our understanding of how successful coaches use micropolitical skills to navigate collegiate coaching. The study advanced what is known about how coaches use adaptability to evolve their coaching practice to the organizational culture, but it was not designed to specifically describe the overall work of a professional coach within a Division I context.

Although much is known about the knowledge and behaviors of high-performance coaches, very little is known about context-specific coaches. In Côté and Gilbert (2009) the authors' definition of effective coaching expressed the importance of a context-specific approach to the application of knowledge. Context is determined by the sport domain, organization, participation vs. performance pathway, sport culture, and gender of participants. NCAA Division I coaches have rarely been studied. Coaches at this level are exceptionally busy, making access to research participation both rare and highly desired by scientists. Uncovering the mysteries of the professional work of Division I coaches can lay a foundation for coach educators/developers to create professional development opportunities for these coaches. Formal coaching education does not prepare coaches within this context for the multiple roles in which they play. Previous research can only be considered a first step towards a more profound understanding about Division I coaching. Harvey et al. (2017) studied the leadership of a female head coach of a NCAA Division I FBS women's soccer program. The study brought to light some tasks of the job and the philosophical approach to the coach's work such as: (a) viewing herself as a life coach; (b) balancing family responsibilities with work; (c) leadership development for athletes; (d) negotiating organizational structures within the university; (e) planning; and (f) the

importance of being a professional, to name a few. However, the findings lack generalizability to the larger coaching population due to the limitations of a single case-study design.

Recent work by Dieffenbach (2020) suggested that the professionalization of coaching movement was designed to enrich and empower coaches by creating better learning opportunities to advance their practice. Accordingly, this requires coaching scientists to gain a better understanding about the role of the coach and the environments in which they work. Coach education has been identified as a key source of raising the standards for coaching practice (Nelson et al., 2013). However, more information is needed about context-specific coaching in order to advance coaching education and professional development. Past research has illuminated that many coaches don't value formal coaching education, citing its lack of relevance, content-heavy delivery, lack of rigor, teacher-centered approach, and disconnected knowledge to real-life experiences (Côté, 2006; Gilbert & Trudel, 1999; Lyle et al., 2009; Nelson et al., 2013). Ideally, when considering elite, high-performance coaches, coach education should be more personalized and contextualized (Lyle et al., 2009), understanding that foundational knowledge is already established at that level.

As it stands, NCAA coaches do not have standardized licensure requirements. Although the majority of coaches must have a bachelor's degree (at minimum), it doesn't have to be in a coaching-specific field. Further, coaching licensure is often a *preferred* qualification, not a requirement, which suggests that NCAA member institutions either do not value coaching licensure, do not think it is relevant to the organization, or may prefer to hire coaches based on other measures. A more contextualized coaching education/development program that is germane to the NCAA might be beneficial to future coaching employers, ensuring that coaches are well-educated in ethical practices, modernized performance training, compliance-related

applications, generational and multicultural issues, as well as contemporary social media concepts. Managers know that the success of an organization depends on the quality of its people (Collins, 2001). Coaches are the athletic program's greatest asset, and there should be great investment to properly equip, train, and support coaches such that the organization, itself, becomes more effective (Lawler, 1996). The professional work of NCAA Division I head coaches has not been represented in the literature. Prior research about the careers of coaches focus more on the development of expertise rather than the organization in which the experts work (Purdy & Potrac, 2016). As Lyle (2002) stated, "Professionalization assumes the capacity to describe professional practice and to recognize those factors exerting the greatest influence on it" (p.117). Greater knowledge about this population of coaches is needed before relevant professional development curricula can be created.

Problem Statement

As coaching practitioners and academics seek to lessen the gap toward professionalization, improving coaching education and development seems to be at the forefront. However, within certain coaching contexts, very little is known about the coach's professional work. Few studies to date have captured the full work of an NCAA Division I head coach. Most of the earlier work focused on NCAA Division I basketball coaches (Becker & Wrisberg, 2008; Gallimore & Tharp, 2004) yet there is far less attention paid to non-revenue sport coaches, particularly in women's soccer. Only two studies to date have examined the knowledge or behaviors of NCAA Division I head women's soccer coaches (see Silva, 2006 and Harvey et al, 2017), but no study has investigated the professional work in its entirety.

One can make general statements about what coaches do within this environment, but there is a paucity of research pertaining to the nuances of the Division I coaching practice, as

well as how working within an NCAA Division I institution might influence what a coach does or what they have to know to navigate this system. Further, formal coaching education has yet to provide relevant professional development opportunities for high-performance coaches that can capture the coaching nuances that are unique to this elite context. Athletic coaches within this setting operate more like CEOs of an organization, which makes their coaching roles highly complex – a position that is not currently part of any formal coaching education curriculum. The visible components of a Division I coach are limited to the performance outcomes, but these coaches have duties that are beyond the surface and can only be uncovered through in-depth study. Integral to coaching professionalization is a greater understanding of the contextual nuances that define what a coach should know and why they should know it. As pointed out by Lyle (2002), “Conceptional clarity leads to operational clarity” (p.36). As we move toward greater understanding of the work of a NCAA Division I head women’s soccer coach, including the requisite knowledge, environmental constraints, barriers and facilitators of success, role complexity, and the yet to be discovered components of the job, coach educators and developers will have more information in which to glean from as they create relevant professional development opportunities for coaches in NCAA Division I institutions. Therefore, it is the purpose of this study to explore the professional work of NCAA FBS Division I soccer coaches to build foundational knowledge within this context in order to create relevant professional development opportunities. With that in mind, the broad research questions are: 1) How do NCAA Division I FBS head women’s soccer coaches understand their professional work? 2) How does a deeper understanding of NCAA Division I head coaches’ experiences of their professional work contribute to coaching education and development?

APPENDIX D

Chapter 2

Extended Literature Review

Although coaching is one of the most popular vocations in the world, its impact is often undervalued. Coaches are responsible for athletes' physical, psychosocial, and character development (USOC, 2017). Few professions can claim to mimic the complexity of a coach, especially a NCAA Division I head coach. Coaches exist in a zero-sum game (winning or losing) which is unlike other jobs in business or industry (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2011). There are other multifaceted expectations of a head coach, like recruiting, revenue-generating, and fundraising. According to the NCAA, coaches are also responsible for ensuring quality academics, graduation rates, fairness in opportunity, student-athlete well-being, championship appearances, and compliance (NCAA, 2018). Each of these responsibilities require knowledge across disciplines, and most of this knowledge does not include sport.

NCAA Division I head coaches are deemed as experts in their field and are expected to have enhanced knowledge, skills, and leadership. In fact, Division I programs are perceived to be the most elite of all the NCAA member institutions. There are over 350 member colleges and universities within Division I that represent over 6,000 athletic teams. They usually have the biggest student bodies, manage the largest athletics budgets, and are resourced with the most athletic scholarships (NCAA, 2018). Further, NCAA Division I schools (FBS schools, in particular), operate in a college sport enterprise where revenue and commercialism is primarily influenced by wins and losses of its programs. These unique characteristics of Division I institutions make the job of a head coach much greater than one who is solely in charge of the technical and tactical development of athletes. The job of a coach requires specialized education

and development that is specific to the profession. Unfortunately, novice coaches, even those at the collegiate level, tend to gain most of their education through experiential, unmediated methods (Gilbert, Côté, & Mallett, 2006). This type of learning has merit, but it doesn't have the benefit of an established common foundation of coaching, researched methods, standards of effectiveness, or accountability of knowledge.

The most profound delineations between Division I coaches and those from other NCAA subdivisions is the amount of money exchanged in this commercial enterprise and the amount of pressure put upon coaches to win. The fiscal impact of a winning season causes many coaches to adopt a lifestyle that promotes sacrifice of anything that hinders winning (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2011). Arguably, the high-stakes environment has led coaches toward unethical practices on a variety of levels including NCAA recruiting violations, fraud, player abuse, athlete exploitation, and sexual assault - to name a few.

For NCAA coaches, the combination of inadequate coach training and unethical practices by our professional coaches brings sport coaching to a crossroad. Recently, there has been a movement to professionalize sport coaching as a response to poor training and unethical coaching practices, but also to serve as a proactive movement in the training of future coaches. Professionalism in other vocations have well-established systems of training, requisite knowledge for practice, pathways to licensure, a code of ethics, and an accountability system - all of which are lacking in the coaching profession. Because coaching as a profession is not established, the way in which coaches are trained is not standardized or regulated.

A big contributor to the lack of coaching standards and uniformity is the way in which sport organizations are governed in the United States. In contrast to the rest of the world, the United States does not govern its individual sport ministries. It is a myth to believe that the

United States Olympic Committee has authority over all of the amateur sport organizations in our country. In fact, they are part of an “unfunded mandate,” meaning that they are funded privately and only have authority on paper, without any government support (Team USA, 2018). In essence, each sport organization operates independently and is only accountable to its own board of directors, who may or may not endorse coaching education.

NCAA coaches are also without standardized qualifications or licensure. In fact, many NCAA athletics departments do not require any coaching license at all or any formal coaching education. Some NCAA institutions consider a bachelor’s degree (of any academic domain) and a certain number of years in coaching as primary qualifiers to employment. To that point, coaches in the NCAA face unique challenges that are not covered in most of the national governing body licensure programs. Unlike any other sport organization in the world, NCAA Division I institutions operate with dual missions: they are both academic and corporate. This duality requires multifaceted expertise from its administration and coaching staff. Unfortunately, most coaches enter the environment under-prepared for the demands of collegiate coaching, which can lead to stress and burnout (Dixon & Bruening, 2005). Although the mission of the NCAA espouses ultimate well-being and support for its student athletes, the same attention is not given to coaches. Moving forward with professional development and education for coaches is necessary to keep coaches trained and in the field.

Advancing formal coaching education and establishing agreed-upon knowledge concepts and application is part of the professionalization movement. The benefits of formal coaching education have not been recorded in the literature. In fact, there are more negatives reported. What is known about perceptions of coaching education is that coaches do not value traditional methodologies (content-heavy, teacher-centered, etc.). Oftentimes, coaches find formal coaching

education irrelevant (McCullick, Belcher, & Schempp, 2005). Part of this irrelevancy is the way in which coaching education is presented. Côté (2006) called this a traditional “top-down” approach, where the instructor creates all of the content for delivery. Coaches and coaching scientists both agree that this is an ineffective methodology and that coaches should have more input into what is presented in coach education.

To continue to advance the profession of coaching by improving coaching education and development, the work of coaches must first be understood. A close look at the coaching literature revealed a large gap into our understanding about what coaches know and what they do. Several authors have made strides to map out coaching concepts and describe the process of coaching (Abraham et al, 2006; Côté et al., 1995; Lyle, 2002; and MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995), but an in-depth account of the work of NCAA coaches has never been done. Mapping the coaching process and establishing a suitable framework for NCAA Division I coaches can be beneficial to coaching educators and developers, as they move forward in creating future coaching curricula. With all of this in mind, the purpose of the study is to provide greater understanding of the professional work of NCAA Division I soccer coaches. Most integral to the coaches’ work are the roles, tasks, and requisite knowledge. Secondly, it is the intent to discuss how advancing our knowledge about NCAA Division I coaches can impact future coaching education and development for this particular population of coaches and potentially, coaches of other collegiate sports.

The following review of literature will contain the following topics in order:

- coaching as a profession
- current state of coaching education
- high-performance coaches

- NCAA Division I coaches
- coaching frameworks
- conclusion

Coaching as a profession

In recent years, coaching practitioners and academics have engaged the discussion about the professionalization of coaching (Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2009). It is suggested that coaches aspire to legitimize the field and be perceived as professionals in the same manner as traditional professions like teachers, lawyers, or medical professionals (Lyle, 2002). Of course, those in opposition to this idea claim that since most sport coaches operate on a volunteer basis, globally, it is inappropriate to compare traditional professions with sport coaches (Taylor & Garret, 2010). Still, that argument cannot be generalized to all sport coaches, as there are a number that view coaching as their primary vocation. In 2018, NCAA member institutions, collectively, employed 26,628 coaches. Smart & Wolfe (2000) reported that coaches should be considered valuable human resources that are hired to create competitive parity or provide a team with a competitive advantage. They are a tangible resource that directly contributes to the overall success of a program. The value of a coach in NCAA Division I member institutions correlates with their wages. Within the NCAA Division I (all subdivisions), the median cumulative amount of salary money distributed to all head coaches per institution was \$1,806,551.00 (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). So, it stands to reason that there is a large body of coaches, at least in the United States, that call themselves professional coaches.

There is a wide choice of available definitions in the literature about what constitutes a “profession.” Bayles (1988) noted there are three necessary conditions for a profession: extensive training, training that is intellectual in kind, and the delivery of an important service.

Chelladurai (1999) claimed that a profession should have four characteristics: an organized body of knowledge, professional authority, community sanction, and a regulative code of ethics.

Rodolfa et al. (2005) suggested that professional practice involves action based on informed judgment, critical thinking, and decision making consistent with the principles and guidelines of the profession. Campone (2014) reviewed documents from seven professional coaching organizations (globally) and found agreement in only two areas regarding the definition of a profession: 1) adherence to ethical standards of practice, and 2) engaging in ongoing personal and professional development.

It isn't the purpose of this writing to resolve the debate about the aspects of a profession, but for the sake of clarity moving forward, the current writing will use the general operational definition from Williams (1998) who described a profession as having five features:

- a defined scope stating the profession's purpose and goals;
- qualifications for education, experience, and professional development;
- a code of professional conduct to guide what should - or should not - be done under given circumstances;
- recognized certification that requires maintenance; and
- standards that are consistent with other peer groups (p. 18).

Expanding on this definition, coaches should provide a specific service to a community (Williams, 1998) as well as have an obligation to social responsibility. Certainly, there should be a complex body of extended professional knowledge and skills where competency is tested (Cross & Lyle, 1999), as well as an advanced and continuous coaching education and professional development system. Finally, professionals should have a code of ethics and be under a governing body that can police unethical practices (Duffy et al., 2011).

Given this definition, what diminishes the coaching profession? Lyle and Cushion (2010) explained several factors that mitigate professionalization in coaching. First, we have not reached a consensus about what makes an effective coach. Regarding high performance coaching, it is highly assumed that those coaches with the best win-loss record are deemed effective. Accepting this definition is dangerous as it could (and does) highlight coaches who may be great recruiters of talent but are not necessarily efficient or effective with given resources. Moreover, there is not an agreed upon approach to coaching evaluation or assessment. Although coaching scientists have developed several behavioral assessments and performance evaluations (Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995), it is unclear how or if practitioners are evaluated consistently (or at all) on coaching-specific behaviors or any domain outside of performance outcomes. Also, coaches are not subject to any professional code of conduct. To that point, there is very little accountability for unethical behaviors. Within some NCAA institutions, coaches are supposed to be held to the same ethical standards as any university employee (Steinbach, 2007). However, coaches are unlike university employees in that they have close relationships with athletes and often serve as surrogate parents. Therefore, the established hard lines of conduct for university employees may not be appropriate for a collegiate coach. Last, coaches do not have common career pathways or consistency in formal education. Compared to traditional professions, coach training and education is way behind. There are no coaching standards or ways to make coaches accountable for their knowledge and effectiveness. Many sport organizations do not have an accountability system or require their coaches to hold a license. To illustrate, Sports Coach UK released figures in 2007 showing that 50% of UK coaches were not certified to practice (Nelson, Cushion, & Potrac, 2013). Concerning United States coaches, it is unknown how many coaches carry sport coaching licenses. Moreover, institutions of higher education do not require coaching licensure

for many sports, although a bachelor's degree and sometimes a master's degree in any field is often required. In summary, without an adopted framework and common standards, coaching - as a profession - will not achieve the same level of recognition and legitimacy as other professions.

One step toward professionalization is enhancing coaching education and development. As described by Middlehurst (1995), professionalization of coaching requires a need for extended education and occupational specialization. The need for advanced education is a global issue. It was recognized in 2000, where a Special Assembly of the International Council for Coach Education (ICCE) gathered at the Swiss Federal Sports Institute (ICCE, 2000). Coach educators from 29 countries attended this gathering to discuss challenges around coach education. The result of the assembly was the Magglingen Declaration, which adopted ten challenges of focus. One challenge referenced ethical behavior and nine referenced modifying coach education and development for the sake of promoting athlete development, wellbeing, and professional coach development (2000).

One result of this global initiative was the formation of the International Sport Coaching Framework (ISCF) (ICCE, 2013). The ISCF provided much-needed information about the general purpose of coaching, knowledge areas for coaches in context, coach education and development, coaching roles and functions, and potential ways to set up a coaching licensure system (2013). Despite the attempt at a thorough, comprehensive framework for sport coaches, it is unknown if these ideas have been implemented in any United States sport organization.

Current State of Coaching Education

Traditionally, formal coach education includes coach learning in certification or award programs developed by sport governing bodies. Additionally, formal coach learning has gained popularity at the university level, resulting in degrees in Athletic Coaching, Sport and Exercise

Psychology, Sport Management, and Exercise Science, to name a few (Cassidy, et al., 2009). Formal coach education, globally, has attracted much debate. It is well documented in the coaching literature that formal coaching education has had a limited impact on the learning and development of coaching practitioners (Nelson et al., 2013). Coaches, themselves, find little value in formal coaching education (Abraham et al., 2006) and many coaches perceive coaching courses that result in licensure as a “box that must be checked.” Ideally, coaching courses should provide substantial professional content knowledge and application that is relevant to graduates and help them be more effective coaches (McCullick et al., 2005). However, research suggests that coach certification programs are not delivered in a manner that benefits coaches (Gilbert & Trudel, 1999). That being said, coaching scientists and those interested in advancing the profession claim that coaching education must be part of the professionalization process.

As stated previously, formal coaching education is not a requirement for NCAA coaches. In fact, there is no evidence that suggests that professional coach development or continuing education is required on an annual basis for collegiate coaches. The NCAA holds no responsibility for training coaches, which leaves coach training and development completely up to the individual coach. Coaches, with their busy schedules, may or may not elect to spend time and money formalizing their development or paying for advanced licensure especially if it is not valued by the coach or required by their employer. In recent years, the NCAA has begun to offer optional professional development programs for coaches such as the NCAA Basketball Coaches Academy, NCAA and NFL Coaches Academy, AFCA/NCAA 35 Under 35 Coaches Leadership Institute, but these are for basketball and football coaches, leaving out many of the non-revenue sport coaches (NCAA, 2018b). Some collegiate coaches have created their own informal professional development online. The Women’s Collegiate Basketball Association (WCBA) has

its own version of professional development, including a variety of learning opportunities like webinars and videocasts that cover the ins and outs of high school and collegiate coaching. This association is a trailblazer for collegiate coach professional development but follows a number of international sport organization leaders like the Football Association (FA) in the UK and the Coaching Association of Canada.

Coaching education limitations have been explored by a number of authors. Lyle, Mallett, Trudel, and Rynne (2009) reviewed commentary from coaching scientists about coaching education. They found that one limitation of current coaching education was that coaches do not follow the same general training and licensing model as other professions. Coaches often gain knowledge and licensure simultaneously, making them practitioners before being qualified. That is never the case in education, law, or medicine. Therefore, formal coach education is often an “afterthought” because it is not always required in order to practice. Gilbert, Côté, and Mallett (2006) studied NCAA Division I volleyball coaches to learn of their coaching education and development and discovered that these coaches spent very little time on formal coaching education. It is unknown how this lack of formal education manifests in a coaches’ professional practice. Rynne (2012) studied the tasks of high-performance coaches in Australia and discovered that coaches were prepared to undertake the coaching tasks specific to sport but underprepared to handle the many other aspects of coaching (administration, liaising with stakeholders, and involvement with research, etc.). Another limitation to current coaching education is the variance in rigor. Some sport organizations require nothing more than an online module and a background check, whereas others require intensified workshops and face-to-face training and evaluation. Other studies have emphasized that there are many blank spaces in the knowledge of coaching, making coach education programs often unrealistic or irrelevant (Bowes

& Jones, 2006). McCullick, et al. (2005) studied the quality of coach certification programs with a sample of coach candidates that participated in a golf coach certification course. The participants reported pedagogical knowledge, content, and the atmosphere or learning environment were most important for their learning experience. More specifically, the coach candidates said that the content delivery should be logical, sequential, and comfortable; taught and modeled by knowledgeable teacher educators; and use an integration of pertinent research in sport pedagogy and subject matter content (2005). Of even greater importance are the varying definitions of “effective coaching” making curriculum design arbitrary and somewhat subjective. Because prior research has failed to produce sound definitions of effective coaching, coach educators cannot adequately develop coaches and provide them with appropriate forms of declarative and procedural knowledge (Abraham & Collins, 1998).

Due to the inadequacies in formal coaching education, most coaches elect to gain knowledge from informal sources like observing other coaches, mentorship, experiences in coaching, and communities of practice (Culver & Trudel, 2006; Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). In fact, it is argued by Abraham et al. (2006) that the progression towards expert coaching has traditionally involved experience, not advanced formal coaching education. To extend that argument, Rossi & Cassidy (1999) mentioned that coaching education has a relatively low impact on coach development compared to the number of hours spent as a player or an assistant coach. Sage (1989) specifically studied the process of becoming a high school football coach and discovered that the majority of role learning was by observing and listening to more experienced coaches. Informal learning is a valid method for enhancing expertise (1989), however, caution is considered when it is the only method used for two reasons. First, the source (mentor) may not be credible and the learned practices often go unquestioned or critically examined (Thomson,

2003). Secondly, without any formal knowledge of theory, pedagogy, or coaching science, the informal learner becomes a practitioner of hunches and assumptions (2003).

Moving forward in coaching education and development. Looking to advance coaching education and development, the needs of coaches should be considered at the forefront. The limited impact of coaching education, according to Côté (2006), is due to the top-down approach. The course content and delivery, historically, have not been designed with the individual learner in mind. To illustrate, Nelson, et al. (2013) designed a study with the intent of capturing coaches' perspectives about the provision of coach education. The authors studied 90 experienced UK coaches across different sports and found that the participants agreed with Côté (2006) - the top-down approach was detrimental to the success of education programs. The participants suggested that courses would be well received if they [the coaches] were directly involved in selecting the course content. Findings from this study successfully established the coaches' preferences for a coach-centered learning environment including: active learning opportunities that involve group collaboration and problem solving; practical experiences; discussion following content delivery; interactive and practical sessions; feedback during practical experiences; and an emphasis on reflective practice. Lack of relevance, out-of-date content, courses that covered too much content, or the feeling of being lectured at were aspects that the participants found to be counterintuitive to an appropriate learning environment (Nelson et al., 2013).

The shift from traditional coaching education methods to future trends certainly reveals a change in paradigm. For formal coach education to have value, the research shows that a coach-centered model is preferred. What is rarely analyzed in the literature is what coaches really need to learn to progress in their profession. Further, it is difficult to hone in on the needs of coaches

when we still don't fully understand the work of coaches. To advance the provision of coach education and the movement toward professionalization, more must be learned about the current roles, tasks, knowledge, and processes of coaches in varying contexts. Coaching scientists must establish a clearer taxonomy of evidence that addresses what coaches need (Drake, 2008). Before we can fully create evidence-based curriculum for coach education and development, we have to have the breadth and depth of the full scope of the coaching profession. Clearly stated by Lyle (2002), "Professionalization assumes the capacity to describe professional practice and to recognize those factors exerting the greatest influence on it" (p.117).

High-Performance Coaches

Roles and tasks. The role of a coach cannot be captured in a "short, pithy, catch-all statement" (Lyle, 2002, p.38). Côté et al. (1995) defined the role of the coach as being similar to a teacher - "to transmit and transform a collective body of knowledge and skills on a given subject in order to help athletes acquire and use that knowledge in various situations" (p.66). Coaches are primarily responsible for the learning of their athletes, but their roles are certainly more complex than that. Coach practitioners serve in a number of roles from teacher to manager to counselor, and even *in loco parentis* - playing the role of both surrogate parent and coach (Sabock & Sabock, 2017). They are required to serve these multiple roles in conjunction with the responsibility for the overall athletic experience of each individual athlete (Potrac, et al., 2000). These roles are divided between those that are seen and unseen (Sabock & Sabock, 2017). On the surface, a coach is a teacher and sport expert. Below the surface, a coach serves as CEO, CFO, media liaison, facility manager, recruiter, travel agent, director of marketing, and community outreach coordinator. Further, they bear the burden of team performance outcomes (2017).

Continuing with a general description of coaching, the International Sport Coaching Framework (ISCF) defined coaching as the “creation of practice and competition opportunities that result in desired outcomes for athletes” (ICCE, 2013, p. 13). Moreover, the ISCF document reported the following general functions of sport coaches: (a) set the vision and strategy of the program, (b) shape the learning environment, (c) build relationships with athletes and others associated with the program, (d) conduct practices and prepare for and manage competitions, (e) read and react to all on- and off-field matters, and (f) practice ongoing learning and reflection (2013, p.16).

Variations of these primary functions are expected since sport coaching is a highly contextualized practice. To this point, coaches must be prepared according to the sport environment in which they work. Coaching contexts are differentiated most often by competition level and desired outcomes (Erickson, Côté, & Fraser-Thomas, 2007). For example, participation coaches have different roles and duties than high performance coaches. The role of the coach changes in response to the stimulus of the working environment (Lyle, 1999). Meanwhile, coaching tasks represent the context and focus of their behavior (Fleishman & Quanitance, 1984). The task of the high-performance coach is to identify, attract, and develop elite athletes (Mallett, Rynne, & Dickens, 2013; Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Sotiriadou & De Bosscher, 2018). They train athletes that compete on national and international levels, which could include Olympic, professional, or collegiate athletes. High-performance coaches practice with intense preparation, great commitment, integrated interventions of a progressive nature, high levels of competition, expectations from the public and/or governing body, advanced decision-making, extreme demands of time, highly-selective talent, extensive interpersonal engagement, full-time compensation, and greater administrative duties (Lyle, 2002; Mallett et al., 2013).

These descriptors are directly tied to on-the-job activities of coaches (ICCE, 2013). Referring back to the ISCF (ICCE, 2013) document, coaching levels were categorized according to the expertise of the coach, and, in turn, definitions of these roles were created accordingly. In reference to high performance coaches, the terms “Advanced/Senior Coach” and/or “Master/Head Coach” are used to define the duties and tasks of coaches (see Table 4 in Appendix H).

In more recent work, Sotiriadou and De Bosscher (2018) detailed the working environment of high-performance coaches, describing it as fast-paced and highly dynamic. Additionally, the authors explained that coaches who train elite athletes usually have specialized facilities equipped with weight rooms, rehabilitation centers, and exercise testing labs. Resources of this magnitude allow for advanced interventions, as well as year-round training and development (2018). Since many elite athletes are competing as representatives of their country or particular sport organization, it should come to no surprise that government bodies and even institutions of higher education put pressure on high performance coaches to win. Performance outcomes often have a pervasive impact on the economy, making the work of a high-performance coach stressful and politically charged (2018).

Shifting from the macro (organizational) level (Sotiriadou & De Bosscher, 2018), to a micro level of study, Maclean and Chelladurai (1995) studied 77 administrators and 363 coaches from Canadian intercollegiate institutions in order to define the dimensions of coaching performance. The authors found that high performance coaches used both behavioral process factors related to the task and behavioral processes related to maintenance of the organization. Participants’ responses were analyzed and categorized into direct and indirect task behaviors. Direct behaviors were defined as those that used interpersonal skills and tactics that enhanced

athlete and/or performance (1995). This included instruction, learning facilitation, and strategic planning for practice and competition. Indirect task behaviors were defined as activities that indirectly influenced the success of the program. Although the authors did not give great clarity to this description, Mallett, Rynne, & Dickens (2013) added that program management, player management, research, recruiting, talent selection, and programming should all fit under that category. Second, Maclean and Chelladurai (1995) fit their findings into two other categories: administrative maintenance behaviors and public relations behaviors. Administrative behaviors referred to the coach's adherence to rules and regulations, attention to organizational processes (paperwork and budgets), and appropriate relations with peer groups and superiors that contribute to the overall health of the organization. Public relations behaviors were described as liaisons between the coach and relevant constituencies (media, alumni, donors, sponsors, etc.). Finally, the authors categorized their findings into team and personal products. Team products were simply defined as performance outcomes. Personal products referenced coaching awards or other forms of recognition. The primary purpose of this study was to develop a scale to measure performance of high-performance coaches, but the secondary purpose was also of great importance - to discover what high performance coaches do, why they do it, and the necessary processes of coaching.

Following Maclean and Chelladurai (1995), Rynne and Mallet (2012) compared the tasks of high-performance coaches in Australia to the results from Maclean and Chelladurai. The authors used qualitative means to unearth and add texture to current knowledge about the work of high-performance coaches. See Table 5 (Appendix I) for a comparison of findings between the two studies.

Mallett and Lara-Bercial (2016) advanced what is known about successful high-performance coaches. They studied both highly successful coaches and elite athletes to determine the reasoning behind their “serial winning.” First, coaches reported that serial winning had to include tasks such as: effective communication, great teaching, planning, managing, decision-making, and relationship building, while athletes added *proper motivation* to the list (2016). The role of coach in this context is more of a partner to the athlete and less of dominant hierarchical power-relationship. Coaches were described as benevolent dictators, where the coach considers the athletes’ interests, but ultimately has to make unpopular decisions (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016).

Not only were the coaching tasks and roles analyzed, but also their values and personality traits. Both coaches and athletes described personality traits of serial winning coaches (SWC) as: hard working, confident, knowledgeable, socially competent, and utilized a positive approach to problem solving. Necessary values were listed as: athlete-centered, moral, and having an appropriate work-life balance (2016). Due to the high-pressure environment, SWCs must be resilient and use the pressure as a catalyst for greater effort (Lara-Bercial & Mallett, 2016). Lara-Bercial and Mallett (2016) also reported that SWCs must be influential in order to build a collaborative environment founded on dialogue, consensus, and respect of athletes’ creativity and knowledge. SWCs have the ability to keep much of the pressure and distractions in perspective, adopting a grounded realist approach (2016). Because of this grounding, the grueling realities of coaching (long hours, time spent away from home, pressure to win, public scrutiny, impact of results, managing a staff, etc.) are normalized, making the role of a SWC both abnormal and revered.

Specific to the NCAA Division I coach context, Dixon and Bruening (2007) described collegiate coaching as a “multifaceted, high-paced work setting full of practices, recruiting, off-season workouts, administrative responsibilities, and teaching duties [that] has created an environment in which only those willing to work 12 hour days, six days a week, for 50 weeks a year can thrive” (p.384). Their main purpose is to modify behaviors and attitudes to achieve a goal (Rocha & Chelladurai, 2011). Similar to high performance coaches in other contexts, this profession requires extensive travel, non-traditional schedules, pressure to win, and job insecurity (2011). The high-stakes culture is an environment that values facetime in the office and long working hours as an indication of success (Dixon & Bruening, 2005). In a mixed-method study of NCAA Division I coaches, Weight, Cooper, and Popp (2015) discovered that coaches sometimes struggle with the values espoused by the organization and those that are part of their personal philosophy. The NCAA outlines the roles and duties of the coach as those responsible for student-athlete wellbeing, graduation rates, academic performance, and compliance, yet coaches are well-aware that their value (and compensation) lies in athletic performance, brand recognition, relationship-building, and revenue facilitation (2015). That being said, some of the coaches in this study viewed their roles as: educators, character-builders, and developers of well-rounded student-athletes, although these were often underappreciated.

It is important to realize that the reviewed literature does provide insight about coaching roles and tasks, but it is very general. The broad nature of role and task definitions in the literature is, arguably, the result of a reductionist approach to data analysis (Mallett et al, 2013), intending to provide foundational knowledge about coaching and create general categories of roles and tasks (see ICCE, 2013). Consequently, there is a gap of understanding about the

specific work of coaches. There is a need to conceptualize coaching tasks to a greater degree in order to properly train coaches to be successful in their daily work.

Requisite knowledge. Requisite coaching knowledge has been the subject of much inquiry, which isn't surprising given the multidimensional nature of the coaching profession. Coaching knowledge is more than just an "autonomous body of facts" (McKay, Gore, & Kirk, 1990, p.62), yet there is much debate about which types of knowledge are required to be considered an effective coach. Perhaps one of the most seminal works about requisite coaching knowledge comes from Côté & Gilbert (2009). The purpose of their study was to present an integrated definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise in order to provide a frame of reference to examine quality coaching.

The findings from this study revealed that the most holistic approach to coaching should include the following: professional knowledge, interpersonal knowledge, and intrapersonal knowledge (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). To truly capture effective coaching, however, coaches also have to consider athlete outcomes and coaching contexts. Côté & Gilbert (2009) integrated coaching knowledge with the following four athlete outcomes: (a) competence, (b) confidence, (c) connection, and (d) character. Considering the proposed aspects of effective coaching, Côté & Gilbert (2009) penned the following definition: "The consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes' competence, confidence, connection, and character in specific coaching contexts" (p.316).

Professional knowledge includes knowledge about the sport, athletes, sport science, coaching theory, pedagogy, and foundational skills (ICCE, 2013). Two forms of professional knowledge are declarative and procedural knowledge (Gilbert & Côté, 2013). Put simply, declarative knowledge encompasses sport-specific knowledge, pedagogy, and the *-ologies*

(physiology, biology, psychology, etc.). Declarative knowledge is also referred to as “the what,” as opposed to procedural knowledge - “the how.” Procedural knowledge is the ability to transform and use declarative knowledge. It is developed over time and used in the following coaching actions: planning, prediction, intuitive decision-making, communication, observational analysis, problem solving, self-monitoring, and perception (2013). The ability to use declarative knowledge instantly, exhibiting automaticity, is the pinnacle of the manifestation of expert procedural knowledge.

Jones, Armour, and Potrac (2003) highlighted the components of professional knowledge in a life-story approach. The authors argued that former research did not capture the nuances of coaching knowledge because no consideration of a coach’s full life story had been studied. Coaching knowledge is accrued over time, and often begins well before coaching employment. Jones and colleagues studied the life story of an elite-level soccer coach working for Aston Villa, a leading club in the FA Carling Premiership, the highest division of professional soccer in England (2003). The coach described the importance of professional knowledge (e.g. sport competency, instruction, and how and when to give feedback), but also emphasized the necessity of implicit knowledge, which can be described as *professional know-how*. Also reported by Santos, Jones, & Mesquita (2013), a level of intuition is necessary to read the needs of the team or respond to nonverbal messages given by the athletes. Elite coaches (like the one presented in Jones et al., 2003) were found to possess this type of knowledge, but it was strongly tied to past experience.

Professional knowledge alone is not enough to become an effective coach. Côté & Gilbert (2009) emphasized that interpersonal knowledge (the ability to connect with people and use social concepts to engage learners) was also essential to effective coaching. Considering that

coaches have to interact with their athletes, athletes' parents, staff, administration, and media regularly, the interpersonal aspect of effective coaching seems logical. Becker (2009) confirmed this fact in a study of elite-level athletes' perspectives of great coaching. Athletes found their relationships to be one of the most significant aspects of their overall athletic experience. The athletes expressed that their relationships were dependent on trust, confidence, and respect (2009; Readdy et al., 2016). Further, the athletes alluded that great coaches connected with them by showing a genuine interest in their wellbeing as athletes and individuals (2009). The ability to connect with athletes is a skill described by Gilbert and Côté (2013). They said that a form of interpersonal knowledge is emotional intelligence. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) explained that emotional intelligence included the ability to perceive, use, understand and manage emotions as ways to properly acknowledge the agency and attitudinal behaviors of self and others. Much work is yet to be done about emotional intelligence and its impact on coaches, but it seems an appropriate fit within interpersonal coaching knowledge.

The life-story study previously mentioned by Jones et al. (2003) furthered our understanding of the application of interpersonal knowledge to the coaching practice. The philosophy of the professional soccer coach in the study was centered on creating positive working relationships with athletes in order to gain respect and create buy-in. The coach described that he needed to show support to the athletes to be able to push them to the highest levels of performance, which was only achieved through the construction of amicable relationships. Potrac, Jones, and Armour (2002) said that the power a coach commands from the athletes may be determined by the strength of their social bond.

Finally, as outlined by Côté & Gilbert (2009), coaching expertise relies on the ability to reflect and be introspective in order to review and revise one's coaching practice, also referred to

as intrapersonal knowledge. Coaches tend to rely on intrapersonal knowledge as a key component of professional development. The practice of reflecting on experiences, evaluating decisions made during training or competition, or considering alternatives to coaching decisions are all ways to add to our intrapersonal knowledge (Schon, 1987; Jones et al., 2003). Lyle (2010) suggested that greater reflection yields greater coaching knowledge that is meaningful to the coach. Similar to expertise in teaching, coaches with introspective capabilities reflect, evaluate, and revise coaching practices to maximize performance outcomes and athlete learning. This type of artistry reflects the concept of orchestration (from Jones & Wallace, 2005). Expert coaches have the ability to notice nuances that are only observable by a coaching *virtuoso* - specialists in artistry (O'Sullivan & Doutis, 1994). This falls under intrapersonal knowledge because of the necessary sensitivity to the uniqueness of each player - their moods, attitudes, cultural influences, and learning styles (1994). Through the process of reflection, coaches learn which practices yield the best performances, which motivations are most effective, and which teaching methods are best received, confirming the importance of reflective practice to effective coaching.

Côté and Gilbert (2009) submitted that coaching context determined the type of knowledge required. For example, high performance coaches for older adolescents and adults need great understanding and knowledge of deliberate practice, physical and mental performance, pedagogy, and how to prepare athletes for life after sport. They also postulated that effective coaches, regardless of context, should integrate all three forms of knowledge in order to produce athlete outcomes (competence, confidence, connection, character) on a consistent basis. Although the findings have been well received in coaching literature, the main gap as it pertains to the present work is that it doesn't capture the work of NCAA coaches. In fact, we know very little about what NCAA coaches do and what they should know.

One reason for our lack of knowledge about particular sport contexts is that sport coaching is not something that is easily understood. It is messy. It involves people. Much of what is currently known about coaches has been studied along traditional lines, often negating studying the coach as a ‘who’ instead of a ‘what.’ Jones (2009) used an autoethnographical approach to convince coaching scientists that this approach had greater capabilities of exploring the coaching profession beyond the surface. Jones’ main argument was that coaching is very relational (2009). Other than Jones et al. (2003), most studies about coaches tend to leave out their lived experiences. Consequently, Jones argued that research must adequately explore and interpret coaches’ subjective life worlds before developing recommendations for good practice (2009). Côté et al. (2009) categorized knowledge and provided coaching science with a widely accepted definition of coaching effectiveness. However, Jones argued that coaching can’t be cleanly articulated and that scientists must recognize the “emotional, ethical, and ambiguous aspects of it which defy” neat and clean operationalizations (2009, p. 378). That being said, coaching knowledge can be enhanced by means of storytelling because coaches can explain “what they know, why they know it, and how they use that knowledge in practical settings” (Jones, 2009, p. 385). This type of knowledge sharing may hold greater relevance to coaches who desire professional development, as it can reveal the hidden knowledge of coaching - the artistry - which coaching research has not fully grasped.

The coaching process. Due to the intrigue of effective coaching processes, much attention has been given to it over the past few decades. Early definitions of coaching used words like “process, coordination, planning, systematic preparation, and improved competition performance” (Lyle, 2018, p. 93). Recent definitions of coaching acknowledge some of the advances in coaching education with phrasing such as: “improved sport performance,

competition, preparation with a purpose, coordination, aggregation of behavior and practice” (2018, p. 93). The nature of coaching is process oriented. The coaching process is achieved in stages navigated by the coach in order to help athletes learn and improve (Borrie & Knowles, 2003). Still, the literature reveals varied definitions of the coaching process. It has been well established in the literature that coaching is a complex process that lacks logical sequence, but rather embodies more of a non-linear, situation and agency-dependent decision-making process (Abraham et al., 2006; Bowes & Jones, 2006; and Jones & Wallace, 2005). Bowes & Jones (2006) defined the work of the coach as ambiguous and obscure. Further, the authors explained that effective coaches tend to operate in a dynamic system - better described as organized chaos - rather than a structured, stable environment. They criticized former coaching models as lacking the peculiarities and intricacies of the coaching process and argued for a more sophisticated approach to coaching education, one that invoked “critical awareness of exactly what their role involves” (p.237).

Recent research identified core principles of the coaching process. Cooper and Allen (2017) studied conceptualizations of the coaching process by expert kayaking and canoeing coaches in the UK. The coaches were asked to create a model of their coaching process. Then they were interviewed to identify and discuss principles and components of the coaching process. Results showed seven core principles categorizing how coaches approached the coaching process: (a) the learning partnership between coach and athlete - with an emphasis on *learning*; (b) individualized - meaning that instruction should be unique to each athlete; (c) clear structure with an evolving process - the coaches used the “plan-do-review” structure (Wikeley & Bullock, 2007) but left the process open to reflective practices and evaluation in order to accommodate needs; (d) orchestrating approach - meaning the coaches practiced varying levels of control

based on the needs of the situation and the learning objectives of the coach; (e) influenced by coaching environment - the physical environment in kayaking and canoeing influences the coaching process, especially considering the skill level of the athlete and the techniques being practiced; (f) holistic and flexible process - the complexity of the coaching process calls for a holistic approach, especially when considering the varying personalities, learning styles, cultural differences, and motivations of athletes; (g) adaptable and dynamic - coaches in this study reported the ever-changing environment, which needs a coach who can be adaptable (2017). These principles helped to guide and shape the coaching processes of the participants.

Underpinning these principles were six categories that influenced the coaching process: (a) values, skills, and knowledge; (b) contextual constraints; (c) learning environment; (d) preparation phase; (e) performance phase; and (f) review/evaluation phase. Coaches acknowledged that their processes were shaped by their values, skills, and knowledge, which accordingly, were dependent on their competencies in teaching, learning, ability to adapt, plan, perform, and reflect on their processes (2017). The coaches in the study did not compartmentalize the components of their coaching processes, rather they articulated a method of planning, performing, and reviewing, which does not fit into a sequential pattern, but was both integrative and idiosyncratic. It does give rise, however, to the complexity of the process and the artistry of its execution sometimes referred to as “orchestration” (Jones & Wallace, 2005; Santos et al., 2013; Readdy et al., 2016).

Santos et al. (2013) studied how coaches use social orchestration in their coaching processes. The authors studied five expert Portuguese coaches from various sports to examine the nature of their work and the pieces of orchestration used to ensure success. Although not explicitly stated, the coaching processes of the Portuguese coaches showed the use of power by

the head coach. A Foucault perspective interprets power as that which permeates every aspect of social life in ways that could benefit or harm relationships (McDonald & Birrell, 1999). To illustrate, coaches reported giving staff the illusion of control by allowing them to have a voice in certain areas, even though it was well known that the head coach had the final say. Further, coaches used impression management to create their “expert” persona to make the players believe that the coach was knowledgeable and worthy of respect. Coaches used their power to intentionally influence athletes or staff toward desired outcomes. The process of guiding athletes is a power play, although not necessarily negative. Participants reported the importance of building relationships with staff and athletes in order to establish a cooperative environment and to maximize goal achievement.

One part of the coaching orchestration involved intentionality from the coach to be unpredictable, which kept the athletes challenged and intensified focus in training sessions (Santos et al., 2013). On the other hand, before competition, the coach switched tactics and reduced the pressure and ambiguity of training methods to create feelings of safety or comfort to preserve their self-confidence. A critical finding about coaching orchestration was the need for a coach to be able to observe situational details that are not easily identifiable. They must possess a “conscious intuition” about the moods, or feelings of individuals in the team (p.270). This also includes the ability to foresee potential conflicts and diffuse contentious situations before they arise. This was referred to as “noticing to inform action,” as coaches used this intuition to make critical decisions. Jones (2009) said that coaches have a way of “noticing ripples on familiar waters” which can lead to bigger things (in Santos, 2013, p. 270). This notion is part of the muddiness of the coaching process that needs further examination. Still, the findings from Santos

and colleagues (2013) go beyond the standard lists and tasks of coaches to inform coaching researchers about how they steer and manage people in order to achieve desired outcomes.

Building upon Santos et al. (2013), the concept of orchestration was applied to study NCAA Division I head coaches (Readdy et al., 2016). This paper reviewed the ways coaches orchestrate to overcome the ambiguities of the coaching process. Jones and Wallace (2005) first introduced orchestration to coaching research. Defined as unobtrusive actions of the coach that are flexible and focused, it was intended to be a better way of understanding how coaches can enhance control and steer athletes toward individual and collective goals in spite of the uncertainties that mitigate the coaching process (2005). Through qualitative methods, Readdy and colleagues (2016) reported that coaches realized their limitations of control on their athletes regarding their non-sport behavior, yet still attempted to maximize their influence or exert direct control over athletes' behaviors. Jones and Wallace (2005) previously outlined the limited control of coaches over their athletes as a major contributing factor to the ambiguity of the coaching process. Readdy et al. (2016) also reported that strategies of orchestration used to overcome the challenges of the job were highly varied in context and method. Still, results suggested that coaches should be mindful of their attitude, practice emotional and behavioral regulation to better facilitate the actions of others, and spend time talking with athletes one on one. Also discovered by Santos et al. (2013), head coaches should practice staff empowerment to promote buy-in and to keep all stakeholders linked toward the same goals. Another promising finding was that effectiveness of the orchestration process was deeply enhanced when certain characteristics were present from the coach such as: love, trust, credibility, empathy, and respect (Readdy et al., 2016). The authors concluded that for coaches to effectively guide athletes toward desired outcomes, specific relational qualities had to be present to create the basis for connection.

A final emergent theme was the requirement of planning. Even though the coaching process is non-systematic and difficult to navigate, coaches insisted that it was necessary to create a solid, structured plan for both practices and games, along with administrative actions like recruiting, team travel, and budgeting. This finding suggests that the coaching process must be organized and flexible at the same time.

The study of effective coaches is intriguing because any serious coach wants to know how to advance his/her practice in order to maximize performance. Mentioned earlier, Mallett & Lara-Bercial studied the traits, tasks, and processes of serial winning coaches (2016). The processes reported in this seminal study mirrored those mentioned by Santos et al. (2013) and Readdy et al. (2016), referring specifically to the importance of creating a coalition of people who are all confident in the leadership of the coach and the process of goal-achievement. Additionally, all studies reported the necessity of strategic planning skills, creating an environment of success, and the significance of proper staff, and athlete selection (Santos et al., 2013; Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; and Readdy et al., 2016). Mallett & Lara-Bercial (2016) advanced the study of the coaching process by reporting *how* SWCs developed their craft.

The coaching literature about coaching processes is still in its infancy. What has been reviewed is only the beginning of what is to be discovered. The use of terminologies such as orchestration (Jones & Wallace, 2005), social orchestration (Santos et al., 2013), decision-making (Abraham et al., 2006), and organized chaos (Bowes & Jones, 2005) all touch on the point that the coaching process is cognitive, artistic, and interpersonal. It remains a very misunderstood concept that is in need of further exploration. Readdy et al., (2016) is the only study that attempted to study coaching processes with Division I head coaches. Despite the intrigue about successful, expert coaches, they are surprisingly understudied. There is a lack of

knowledge about their work and the ways in which they steer athletes toward desired objectives.

The next section reports what is known about NCAA Division I head coaches.

NCAA Division I Coaches

Like other successful, high-performance coaches, NCAA Division I coaches operate in the “big time” sport arena, where they are paid handsomely and the expectations of winning highly influence how a coach approaches his/her job. One of the unique features of NCAA Division I athletics is that it is a commercial entertainment entity within an educational setting (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). This also adds a dimension to high performance coaching that differentiates the collegiate coach from other high-performance coaches. Division I coaches are charged with winning to satisfy the socio-political elements, while still ensuring that athletes comply with eligibility rules and academic regulations imposed by the NCAA and the institution in which they are enrolled. Coaches of other universities do not face the same challenges, as most institutions of higher learning do not offer full scholarships to their athletes (e.g. Canada) or do not offer varsity athletics at their collegiate institutions (e.g. England). NCAA Division I sports are associated with television contracts, revenue production, and high levels of visibility (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). Although there are similarities between international high-performance coaches and those coaching in the NCAA, the conflicting nature of athletics and academics within an economically-driven entertainment medium is unlike any other in the world.

To fulfill any coaching role, specific knowledge and processes must be present. To date, very few Division I coaches or programs have been studied. Most of the coaching research about Division I coaches is outdated and doesn't apply to the modern-day coach. Previous literature studied former head men's basketball coach at UCLA, John Wooden (Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; Tharp & Gallimore, 1976), former head women's basketball coach at University of Tennessee,

Pat Summitt (Becker & Wrisberg, 2008; Wrisberg, 1990), and former head football coach at Arizona State, Frank Kush (Langsdorf, 1976), but these coaches were from a different generation and it is hard to report findings from these studies and assume they apply to the current Division I coach.

The modern-day NCAA Division I coach (across all sports) is not widely understood. The few recent studies that have explored Division I coaches (Harvey et al., 2017; Jenny, 2007; and Silva, 2006) only provide a glimpse of what coaches do and how they do it. The most relevant to the present study is from Jenny (2007). The author focused on defining, measuring, and labeling characteristics of effective coaching in NCAA Division I and II running programs. Although not empirical research, the concepts Jenny (2007) discussed provided insight into the coaching knowledge and roles of Division I and II distance running coaches. The highly individualized nature of distance running takes a unique set of knowledge, processes, and competencies than a coach of a team sport. Even the nature of winning is different since a distance running coach can be a winner with only one athlete. Although there are differences, Jenny (2007) reported that many coaching components are transferable to all sports. Elements within direct intervention (Lyle, 1998, Maclean & Chelladurai, 2006; Mallett et al., 2010) such as those that involve training and competition, as well as intervention support (recruiting, planning, scheduling, and goal setting) were all considered to be necessary competencies of effective running coaches. Also, Jenny (2007) reported that coaches should understand physical training, particularly periodization (Bompa, 1994), as well as a general understanding of: physiology, biomechanics, resistance training, cross training, competition planning, peaking and tapering, nutrition, psychology, flexibility, aerobic capacity, NCAA compliance, injury prevention, pedagogy, lifestyle management, sports medicine, practice management, and altitude

training. Further, coaches must understand constraints management (human & material resources), as well as their extended roles as a coach in the NCAA (knowing NCAA rules and acting as liaison between the NCAA and the university). Finally, coaches must be adept in strategic coordination (strategic planning and contingency management) (Lyle, 1998).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to uncover the coaching components and processes of each sport within NCAA Division I. However, the present study will examine NCAA FBS Division I soccer coaches. The next section reviews the literature that is specific to this coaching context.

NCAA Division I soccer coaches. Previous work about Division I soccer coaches does not attempt to discover their overall professional work, so what is known about these coaches is based on inferential analysis of two studies. The first, from Silva (2006), studied Coach Anson Dorrance, long-time head women's soccer coach at the University of North Carolina. Coach Dorrance is well established as one of the most successful coaches in NCAA women's soccer with 21 NCAA national championships (Carolina, n.d.), numerous All-Americans, and also coached the 1991 U.S. women's national team to a World Championship title. The author interviewed Coach Dorrance to discover his approach to the game, mostly from a philosophical and psychological perspective. One aim of the paper was to describe his philosophy and tactics that made his success so prominent. Because the paper was authored by a sports psychologist, it steered away from technical and tactical components of soccer and settled into the psychological domain of coaching. To this extent, Coach Dorrance explained that part of his job was to create a competitive learning environment, either turning players into ferocious competitors or separating those who were unable to handle the intensity of such competition. The competitive learning environment mirrored those of John Wooden and Pat Summitt (Becker & Wrisberg, 2008;

Gallimore & Tharp, 2004; Wrisberg, 1990) but with the added intensity of separating the athletes that had greater tolerance for competition from those who did not. In this case, the role of the coach was not necessarily to create unity or cohesion, which may be indicative of the high expectations of team products at this level, and from a coach with a winning history.

Coach Dorrance described his role as one who cultivates leadership, character, responsibility, and unselfishness - also categorized as direct task behaviors (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995). Silva (2006) did not capture the facets of the job that are part of the daily grind, the things a coach has to know to operate at the Division I level, or ways in which coaches process information in order to make decisions. The results were constrained to uncover the psychological components of Coach Dorrance's coaching style and did not intend to go deep into the professional work of a Division I soccer coach.

In a more recent study, Harvey, Voelker, Cope, & Dieffenbach (2017) explored the constructs and processes that shaped the coaching career of a 20-year, female, NCAA Division I head soccer coach. Again, continuing with the necessity of dissecting tasks, roles, requisite knowledge, and coaching processes from literature that might have a different intent, it was possible to draw out some key tasks and roles of this soccer coach. First, the coach reported several task-related behaviors (MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995) including: direct instruction, feedback, and overall player development (Harvey et al., 2017). Second, the coach was adamant about developing relationships with her players and providing them support. She called herself a "life coach." In this role, she served as a support and motivator to the athletes in their academics, athletics, and life goals, which agrees with the interpersonal components of effective coaching from Côté & Gilbert (2009). Not only was she responsible for the development of the person from a holistic perspective, she felt a responsibility to be their motivator. Also, there was no

question that she centered her coaching around player development, but ultimately, winning was the main goal. These findings mirror those from other work (Côté & Gilbert, 2009) that differentiated high performance coaches from others, especially those that are coaching at the NCAA Division I level. Another direct task was leadership development. The coach believed that developing leadership was very important and that she gave her players, "...every opportunity to lead" (Harvey et al., 2017, p.10).

Of particular interest, this was the only coach that directly mentioned the importance of reflective activity as it pertained to her coaching practice. The coach said, "as a professional, I dedicate a lot of time to planning and reflecting both on what my team needs to do and has done and on my own plans and actions as a coach" (Harvey et al., 2017, p.13). It is unclear why other coaches did not mention reflection as part of their coaching process. It is possible that the interviewers did not attempt to draw that out, or it may be that reflective practice wasn't explicit to the coaching process until recently.

There is a need to explore in great depth the concept and meaning of the collegiate coach in order to interpret and evaluate practice and to guide further development. As pointed out by Lyle (2002), "Conceptual clarity leads to operational clarity" (p.36), which can be achieved with coach education and development. Given this lack of knowledge about what NCAA Division I coaches do, one way to learn more about current coaches is to focus our attention to the current job market. The NCAA marketplace posts jobs and job descriptions. Table 6 (see Appendix O) shows three programs that are currently (at the time of this writing) seeking to hire coaches for NCAA Division I soccer programs (NCAA, 2019b).

Summarizing this section on successful NCAA Division I soccer coaches, it is apparent that there is still much to be learned about this population of coaches. It is difficult to say that a

coach at this level serves in a role that is easily identifiable and labeled. Certainly, the role of teacher, leader, and manager is apparent, as these are central to the coaching vocation. However, the modern-day Division I soccer coach has evolved in the past decade to include roles and tasks that have not been fully realized in coaching literature. Further, our understanding of the coaching process and the type of knowledge required is still in its infancy. Coaching science research has attempted to map out the coaching profession to understand its complexity in order to define the process so those working in coaching education and development can decrease the gap between what we know about coaching and how to best develop the profession. The next section reviews what is known about coaching frameworks.

Coaching Frameworks

Cross and Ellice (1997) asserted that the reason behind creating coaching frameworks is to improve coaching performance and elevate effective coaching practices, yet, the literature on coaching frameworks is limited. That being said, the complex nature of coaching makes it difficult to map the coaching process. In fact, Lyle (2007) argued that the coaching process may be too difficult to map. Despite creating his own model (Lyle, 2002), the author argued that much time has been spent trying to model the coaching process without any consensus on a working model. He offered that perhaps it is unnecessary to model a process that is so dynamic and filled with many uncontrollable factors because a model that truly depicted all of the complexities of coaching wouldn't be readable or beneficial. Cushion, Armour, and Jones (2006) also recognized the challenges of mapping out a process that portrays the messy realities of coaching while presenting it in an accessible format that can be applied by coaching educators. In their summative work on coaching models, Cushion et al. (2006) categorized current models into those 'for' and 'of' the coaching process. Models 'for' the coaching process represent ideal

practices that are created from identifying assumptions about the coaching process and are more conceptual in nature (Cushion, et al., 2006; Lyle, 1999). Models ‘of’ the coaching process are based on empirical findings of expert coaches (Lyle, 2002). Most models ‘for’ the coaching process (Fairs, 1987; and Franks et al., 1986;) were limited and deemed to be too reductive, as they failed to recognize “the dynamic interpersonal nature of coaching relationships” and other complexities that impact decision making (Cushion et al., 2006, p.87). Further, these models lacked context and applicability (Lyle,1999). On the other hand, models ‘of’ the coaching process were developed by analyzing expert coaches, usually through observation and/or interviews (Cushion et al., 2006).

Models ‘for’ the coaching process. Lyle (2002) produced the most successful holistic coaching model ‘for’ the coaching process of his day. The model consisted of components that were termed, “building blocks” (p.99). These building blocks consisted of coaching components such as: goal setting, coaching expertise, systematic development, and planning - to name a few. Lyle said one should view “the coaching process as a wall constructed of building blocks. The same building blocks are used in each wall, but they are of different sizes and quality, and constructed differently by each coach” (2002, p.99). In essence, the model is a continuous cycle of activities that center on performance goals. Carefully created, it captured the variability of coach interventions, athlete activity, and organizational activity, while also maintaining the flexibility to respond to external constraints and performance goals. The model is regulated by “constant feedback loops and a series of threshold decisions” made by the coach (p.107). In spite of its comprehensiveness, the model was criticized as being too complicated. Although not presented here, the graphical version is highly complex and difficult to follow. It might be unfair to criticize a model for being thorough, but it does make it highly impractical for application.

Models ‘of’ the coaching process. After reviewing Lyle’s (2002) model, it is safe to conclude that the task of modeling the coaching process is extremely difficult. On one hand, models ‘for’ coaching (with the exception of Lyle (2002)) are too simplistic. Yet, an overly complex model undermines the utility for application. Also, most of the models ‘for’ the coaching process relied on quantitative measures. In contrast, models ‘of’ coaching were predominantly qualitative (e.g. in-depth interviews or coach recall). This section of the review will describe three models ‘of’ coaching - the coaching model (Côté et al., 1995), the scale of coaching performance (Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995), and the coaching schematic proposed by Abraham, et al. (2006).

The coaching model. Côté et al., (1995) proposed the coaching model, which has been highly referenced and cited in the coaching science literature. The coaching model (Côté et al., 1995), was created in response to a lack of comprehensive applicable coaching frameworks that represented the complex nature of sport coaching. The authors interviewed 17 expert Canadian gymnastic coaches and created a model based on grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) principles. The utility of this model was suggested by Côté et al. (1995) to be used as a basis to define which knowledge was important for use in competition, training, and organization, while considering the peripheral components that could impact the coaching process either positively or negatively. One limitation of this model was that its participants were gymnastics coaches - an individual sport. To give more validation and generalizability across sport contexts, Gilbert & Trudel (2000) slightly modified Côté et al., (1995) and chose a single-case study with a university ice-hockey coach. Results showed that support was found for all six components of the coaching model, even amongst contextual differences - individual vs. team sport. Also, the model successfully depicted coaching tasks related to the process. Differences between the two

studies seemed to relate to the preferences of coaches, as well as contextual sport differences between gymnastics and ice hockey (2000). Although the findings from this study seemed to validate the coaching model - at least in its contextual generalizability - the model was criticized for its lack of complexity in sufficient detail of conceptual, dynamic, and adaptive aspects of the process (Cushion et al., 2006).

The scale of coaching performance (SCP). Another model 'of' the coaching process was proposed by Maclean and Chelladurai (1995). The authors set out to define the dimensions of coaching performance and to develop a scale to measure them. Through an examination of the literature and later validation by a panel of experts, the authors created a 56-item coaching performance scale consisting of six dimensions: team products, personal products, direct task behaviors, indirect task behaviors, administrative maintenance behaviors, and public relations behaviors. They sent the scale to 77 athletic administrators and 363 coaches from the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union. The model assumed an occupational approach - outlining job tasks of coaches - and an organizational approach, which categorized the domains of coaching performance into behavioral products or behavioral processes (1995). The measurement scale was proven to be psychometrically sound to measure the six dimensions of coaching performance and successfully outlined many occupational tasks but did not advance any knowledge about the coaching process, specifically (Cushion et al., 2006).

The coaching schematic. Abraham, et al. (2006) created a model called the coaching schematic to map the coaching process. This was a theoretically-derived framework created with the intent to describe the hierarchical decision-making of coaches. In contrast to Côté et al. (1995), the authors argued the utility of a schematic to create a "tidy and concise conceptual description of knowledge areas, concepts, and performance environments that reflects the

coaching process” (Abraham et al., 2006, p.550). The purpose of the study was to validate a coaching schematic that, through its design and content, would accurately reflect the coaching process in its entirety. The schematic was also designed to be transferable to all coaching contexts. The authors reported that coaching is primarily a decision-making process. In light of that knowledge, we still don’t know if the model has successfully impacted coaching education and development. Further, it hasn’t been used to examine other coaching contexts, so it is uncertain if it would apply to a NCAA collegiate coach.

Despite the criticism of coaching models, one can’t deny that the work by the aforementioned authors has made important contributions to current knowledge about the coaching process. Coaching education and development have continued to build off of previous work in order to bring better understanding about coaching. Mentioned earlier, the ICCE created the International Sport Coaching Framework to represent the work of coaches in both text and graphic form (ICCE, 2013). This was, however, a very general framework for coaching that was purposely constructed for multi-contextual use. Also, it was created with an international lens, which does not really account for the unique environment of a NCAA athletic program. Within an American context, the United States Olympic Committee drafted a similar framework that was geared toward national governing bodies in the U.S. (USOC, 2017). The theme behind the framework was to equip partner organizations with information regarding developing quality coaches. A noteworthy endeavor, and a step toward enhancing the provision of coach education and development, it lacks the specificity to a NCAA context.

The reviewed coaching frameworks represent a body of work that attempted to explore, define, and represent the coaching process and the general work of coaches in an organized fashion. Despite the criticism of models in the coaching literature, evidence from teaching

suggests that models of practice (e.g., Entwistle & Peterson, 2004; Mosston & Ashworth, 1994) can be crucial in developing these mechanisms (scaffolds) to guide relevant questions and instructions; often enabling subsequently more self-directed growth (Abraham & Collins, 2011). Ideally, a coaching framework informs coach educators about the coaching process in order to expedite coaching development.

Conclusion

This paper is grounded in the belief that enhancing professionalism must begin with changing the system in which coaches are developed. To advance the professionalization of coaches, a clear definition of the work they do and their professional responsibilities is necessary. Current coaching education is not valued by most high-performance coaches because it fails to put the needs of the coach, as a professional, at the forefront. Coaches seek strategies of learning to enhance their knowledge and problem-solving capabilities (Readdy et al., 2016) necessary to perform well. However, the current system is not valued because there isn't a coach-centered approach to delivery. This statement is supported by the fact that we don't fully understand the work of coaches at a NCAA Division I level. Enhanced understanding about coaching in context can help inform those that are responsible for coach education or professional development to create relevant curricula.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to gain an understanding of the work of NCAA FBS Division I soccer coaches. Additionally, it is the intent of this writing to discuss how this information can inform future coaching education and development for NCAA coaches.

APPENDIX E

Chapter 3

Methodology

Despite what is known about the work of high-performance coaches, there is still much to learn about specific subgroups in this context. Referring to the present study, very little is understood about high-performance coaches who work within the NCAA DI FBS, especially those of nonrevenue sport teams. Qualitative methods offer an effective way to understand a phenomenon in great depth and breadth. It has been suggested that sport and exercise science behaviors are best investigated through heuristic methods, using in-depth interviews and interpretational analysis (Côté et al., 1993). Additionally, coaching researchers have recommended that coaches, themselves, should be part of the research process to fully understand the pragmatic constraints of their work (Cooper & Allen, 2017; Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). These suggestions, along with the aims of the study, fit nicely within the constructs of an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm which emphasizes that truth is created from multiple realities, socially constructed, and dependent upon people or groups for meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Former attempts of conceptualizing the coaching profession did not fully capture the work of coaches in specific contexts. In particular, the professional work of NCAA Division I FBS soccer coaches had yet to be studied. With the level of immaturity in NCAA coaching research, the current study drew from prior literature about high-performance coaches (e.g. Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Mallett et al., 2013; Rynne & Mallett, 2012) to compare across subgroups but also to discover any contextual differences. This was considered a preliminary study with the understanding that more work is necessary to build a body of research that would

eventually help coach educators and developers provide quality professional development opportunities.

As is typical for studies conducted from the constructivist standpoint, the objective of the study was designed to make meaning of the work of NCAA D I FBS head women's soccer coaches, including the contextual characteristics of working in a DI FBS institution, job responsibilities, requisite knowledge, job challenges, and coaching processes. A secondary aim was to discover what current DI coaches would advise future DI coaches to do or learn to enhance their preparedness for coaching in a DI context. A complete description of the methodology of the present study is outlined in the following order: 1) participants and sampling, 2) procedures, and 3) data analysis.

Participants and Sampling

High-performance coaches operate in similar environments as NCAA DI FBS coaches (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Readdy et al., 2016). Despite their similarities, previous literature about high-performance coaches (Mallett & Lara-Bercial, 2016; Rynne & Mallett, 2016) has not included coaches their work within an NCAA organizational context. Further, any literature about the descriptors of an NCAA organization tends to be perceived from a revenue sport lens (Humphreys et al., 2016). Therefore, sampling for the present study was purposive to include coaches that represented head women's soccer coaches in NCAA DI FBS institutions (Patton, 2002). Additionally, reliance on participants' perspectives about work experiences in an effort to understand a phenomenon requires a credible sample. Thus, an expert systems inclusion criterion was employed. This was modified from other studies who used a similar approach (Abraham, et al., 2006; Cooper & Allen, 2017; and Côté et al., 1995) to include the following criteria: (a) tenure as a Division I head coach for a minimum of ten years; (b) five years as an FBS head

coach; (c) overall winning percentage of .500 at the Division I level; and (d) developed at least one NCAA All-American athlete. Typically, an expert systems approach utilizes a fifth criterion that shows the approval of colleagues within the coaching profession (e.g. coach of the year award at the conference or national level) but it was removed from selection criteria as it restricted the sample pool too far and it was deemed to be the weakest of the criteria given its subjective measurement. Furthermore, FBS coaches that worked in military universities were eliminated as it was thought to be outside the typical university environment. Last, coaches whose anonymity would be difficult to protect based on level of celebrity were also eliminated from participation.

Following purposive sampling, participants were conveniently sampled by constricting the geographical distance of participants (Flick, 2011). Only those within 250 miles driving distance of the interviewer (the mid-Atlantic region) were considered, as the research design included face-to-face interviews.

The appropriate number of participants for qualitative research is predicated on the research question and purpose of the study. The purpose of the present study was not to develop a new theory, nor was it an attempt to produce results of a representative sample that could be generalized to a larger population. Rather, it was meant to add contextual depth to the current literature about high-performance coaching through an examination of the job experience within a unique organizational context. Further, it was the intention to discover how coaching education and development could be enhanced to better prepare future coaches. With the study aims in mind, the sample size included four participants ($n = 4$). The smaller sample size allowed for greater in-depth analysis and was used to collect preliminary results to create foundational points for further exploration of this population of coaches.

A review of the online coaching profiles of all Division I FBS head women's soccer coaches working within the mid-Atlantic region revealed that there were 16 coaches that met the initial selection criteria. Of the 16, four agreed to participate. Recognizing that detailed description of a small sample could violate anonymity of participants, reported demographics were limited to information deemed essential for understanding the results. The sample consisted of four NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coaches (3 males, 1 female) all over the age of 40. Coaching experience at the DI level ranged between 10 and 20+ years. FBS coaching experience ranged between 5 and 20+ years. Participants' winning percentage ranged from .60 to .73 ($M = .67$, $SD = 0.05$). Half of the coaches had coached between 1 and 10 All-Americans, whereas the other half had coached over 20 All-Americans. A summary of each coach's level of expertise is presented in Table 1 (see Appendix A).

Procedures

Recruitment. Following approval by the West Virginia University Institutional Review Board (IRB), recruitment emails were sent to all 16 eligible coaches through Qualtrics (see Appendix K). Follow up emails were sent to participants biweekly until a total of four coaches committed to participate (see Appendix M). The email included study information, consent to participate, and a link to a Qualtrics demographic survey (see Appendix L) which collected data to verify the coach's eligibility of all inclusion criteria. After consent was given, the researcher contacted the participants by email to schedule a date and time for the interview. The process to recruit and interview four coaches took approximately 120 days.

Data collection. Participants engaged in face-to-face, semi-structured interviews. Interviews were conducted by the lead researcher between June and September 2019. Participants chose to meet at locations that were quiet, allowing for flow of conversation and

conducive to quality recording. Interviews lasted between 44 and 122 minutes ($M = 83$ minutes) and transcribed verbatim using NVIVO Transcription software. Participants were given a two-week window to review and augment their interview transcript to allow for respondent validation and to clarify any ambiguities in the transcript (Guest et al., 2012), however, no participants asked to make changes in their transcripts.

Interview guide. The interview guide consisted of a framing introduction to be read to participants and a series of probing questions. The interviews began with a vignette, followed by a reading of a job description (see Appendix N). The vignette was written by the lead researcher and validated by two other experts in the field. It was also tested in the pilot interview. The vignette (Miles, 1990) was a hypothetical scenario written to frame subsequent interview questions around the idea of an experienced DI coach giving advice to a coach just beginning his/her DI coaching career. For example, the vignette included the following snippet:

Coach Smith has recently been offered a head coach position at an NCAA DI FBS institution. The coach respects your wisdom as both a soccer coach and a professional and would like to pick your brain about some of the expectations of working in this context. The two of you meet for coffee to discuss some of the ‘unwritten’ components of a DI head coaching job. You try to think back to a time when you were in Coach Smith’s shoes to remember some of your initial impressions of your first DI head coaching job. Coach Smith begins the conversation by asking, ‘What is it like working at an NCAA DI FBS university as opposed to other coaching environments?’

The interview guide designed to explore several themes related specifically to the coach’s perspective of their job: unique components of working in a DI organization, primary duties of the job, required knowledge, overarching objectives, processes of achieving objectives,,

job challenges, and coach learning. The list of topics to explore were generated from multiple sources including the organizational behavior literature concerning jobs and how people work (Schein, 1990; Schneider & Konz, 1989); existing literature on high-performance coaching (Maclean & Chelladurai, 1995; Readdy et al., 2016; Rynne & Mallett, 2012); and from gaps in the literature about NCAA coaches' work.

The questions were open-ended and followed with probing questions such as, "Could you tell me more about that?" The second component of the interview guide was the reading of a job description. The job description was a modified job announcement for an NCAA DI FBS head soccer coach (NCAA, 2019b) which included the job responsibilities, minimum qualifications, and preferred qualifications of a candidate (see Appendix O). Coaches were asked to read the job description and then comment on each job responsibility as it related to the realities of their job. For example, the job description listed "Responsible for recruiting highly skilled athletes." The coach would either agree or disagree with this statement and was probed to elaborate on their response.

Trustworthiness. Within an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm, it is common for the researcher to be the primary instrument for data collection. Additionally, it is considered advantageous when the researcher is similar to the participants, allowing for greater understanding and interpretation of responses (Charmaz, 2014). However, both the researcher as instrument and the likeness to the study participants can pose potential threats to trustworthiness. According to Poggenpoel and Myburgh, (2003), the research as instrument can be the greatest threat to trustworthiness in qualitative research if adequate time is not spent in preparation for interviewing. Further, it is challenging for researchers who are like study participants, as they can be prone to limiting their curiosities and only discovering what they think they don't know

(Chenail, 2011). The researcher was a former collegiate soccer coach, which ran the risk of imposing pre-existing beliefs on participants during the interview process. To account for potential threats to trustworthiness, the researcher practiced interviewing with an NCAA Division II soccer coach and an NCAA DI FBS head volleyball coach, which were recorded and asynchronously reviewed by a faculty member who was an experienced interviewer. This allowed the researcher an opportunity to refine interviewing skills, as well as check for biases or leading questions.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this research was to understand the work of a coach from their own perspective. Utilizing an interpretivist-constructivist lens (Sparkes & Smith, 2014), the present study followed the stages of applied thematic analysis (ATA) to analyze data (Guest et al., 2012) which included: 1) read verbatim transcripts, 2) identify possible themes, 3) compare and contrast themes across transcripts, and an optional fourth step - build theoretical models using constant comparison (2012). Safeguards were taken to ensure that the results reflected the coaches' perspectives, as both the lead researcher and a senior reviewer trained in thematic coding analyzed the data to enhance trustworthiness (Guest et al., 2012). The senior reviewer had experience with qualitative data analysis as well as being familiar with the coaching science literature. Further she had over 20 years coaching experience in a non-soccer context which provided an informed but revoked review of the data.

Data analysis began after each interview. To protect the anonymity of the interviewees, the pseudonyms of Pat, Finley, Sidney, and Charlie were used. One by one, the lead researcher read through the transcripts multiple times to gain familiarity with the data and then engaged in reflexive journaling to record ideas, assumptions, and initial thoughts (Charmaz, 2014). During

this process, initial codes were created by identifying meaning units that represented ideas pertinent to the participants' perspectives of their work. After initial coding of all transcripts, the lead researcher used focused coding to look for summary codes from each participant's dataset (Saldana, 2016). Additionally, analytic memos were written to capture reflections about potential themes and to record ideas about the interviews that can be lost in a reductive approach (Charmaz, 2014). Codes were defined in a codebook but were continuously modified as analysis progressed (Guest et al., 2012). This was an iterative process that required reexamination and reflexive thought until the codes were grouped into lower and higher-order themes. Themes were checked and discussed with the senior reviewer before grouping them into overarching categories. Finally, both the lead researcher and senior reviewer discussed the final descriptions of the categories and themes to maximize how effectively they depicted the participants' perspectives as well as the aim of the research question. It is important to note that the categories were not explicitly preconceived, as data were analyzed across the interview. Theoretically-derived category were created based on the data that emerged. See Table 7 for a complete list of coding frequencies for categorical headings, higher and lower-order themes, and summary codes (Appendix P).

APPENDIX F

Chapter 4

Extended Results

Based on the two research questions in this study, the findings revealed how the participants perceived their professional work. Primarily, participants reported the types of knowledge and processes they used to do their job. In addition, results revealed participants' ideas about what to include within coaching education that is relevant to the work of a NCAA DI FBS head women's soccer coach. Findings were organized under six categories: 1) DI contextual characteristics – components of the job that are unique to working in an NCAA DI FBS athletic organization; 2) Job responsibilities – tasks and primary objectives of the coach; 3) Coaching processes – the elements involved in achieving objectives; 4) Knowledge requirements – what coaches should know to do their job; 5) Job challenges – common struggles associated with the job in the DI context; 6) Coach learning – the ways coaches learned to do their work in the past and present, as well as what future coaches should know to do the job.

DI Contextual Characteristics

Participants were asked to share their perceptions of working within a DI FBS environment as opposed to other coaching environments. Responses regarding this question were organized under the category, contextual characteristics. This category had one higher-order theme – components unique to DI - and four lower-order themes - resources, pressure, elite level, and considering the student-athlete. Components unique to DI included the ways in which the coach's work at an NCAA DI FBS institution was impacted by the contextual elements of this environment. All four coaches commented on the differences in resources compared to other NCAA schools. The resources mentioned included operating budgets, athletic scholarships, and

human resources (e.g. assistant coaches and athletic support staff). Two of the four coaches said that resources were at a level that didn't require any fundraising. One coach reported that fundraising was necessary only when there was a desire for a facility upgrade. Two coaches reported fundraising only when they wanted to make an international trip. Regarding human resources, all coaches mentioned having a coalition of support staff including three assistant coaches - two full-time and one part-time or volunteer. Additionally, all coaches reported having support staff within the athletic department which included: compliance, business and accounting, sports information and media, athletic training, strength and conditioning, sport psychology, academic advising, nutrition, team operations, and events management personnel.

The next lower-order theme under components unique to DI was pressure. Pressure was defined as the increased demand to win at this level. Summary codes under pressure included internal and external pressure. All four coaches spoke of the internal pressure to win due to their competitive drive. One out of the four coaches reported that external pressure from administration existed at the DI level and that it was evolving to reflect demands similar to revenue sports.

...I have seen over the last 10 or 12 years pressure from administrations to have a successful program...Looking around the country at the coaching turnover in our sport - in particular, fifteen years ago - you rarely saw a lot of soccer coaches getting fired for just not winning enough. You know it would happen in a few places and those places you kind of knew they were really serious about their programs. But I think now we're seeing it more and more that if in five years or so you don't have it heading in the right direction, you probably need to be kind of preparing yourself (Pat).

Finley disagreed with the notion of pressure from administration – “It's more rare that you get fired for your win-loss record in women's soccer than maybe you would be in men's basketball... Now if I go [0 wins - 18 losses] three years in a row, I'll fire myself, you know. So, you don't feel that pressure” (Finley).

The next lower-order theme under components unique to DI was elite level. Summary codes within elite level included elite competition, elite recruits, and the professional environment established by the coach. Three of four coaches spoke about the elite level of competition and the difficulties of winning a DI national championship. Three of four coaches mentioned the number of talented players that were vying for selection to a winning DI program. Three of four coaches spoke about their players that eventually went on to play professionally. One coach touched on the importance of creating a professional environment that included elite coaching, training, and making the athlete feel important. Charlie said that he trained his players like professionals and created the most professional atmosphere he could – “[At] DI, there was the elitist...almost like a professional level for those players, and they wanted it to be 100 percent every day, focused. So, it challenged me as a coach to be at my best.”

The last lower-order theme for components unique to DI was considering the student-athlete. One summary code under this theme was academic consideration. All four coaches recognized that their players were also students. Two out of the four coaches mentioned being lenient with players when it came to balancing academics with athletics. Both coaches said they allowed players to miss practice if they felt it would help them academically. Finley mentioned how seriously he took academics and how much he respected the players' academic achievements:

[The] academic piece is something that I take seriously...You know. There's no shortcuts here, for students, I mean. That's why I have so much respect for our kids [and] how they managed to have a 3.6 GPA in the year that we went to the final four" (Finley).

All four coaches remarked that they had a role regarding managing the academic success of their student-athletes. Charlie said that about 20% of his job was spent meeting with players – "It's day to day with your players. You can't neglect that."

Job Responsibilities

Turning to the question of the interview that asked coaches to compare the realities of their job to the job description from the NCAA marketplace, we look at the next category - job responsibilities. This category included two higher-order themes – tasks and objectives.

Tasks was comprised of three lower-order themes. The first was direct coaching tasks. Direct coaching tasks included the following summary codes: player development and team training. All four coaches spoke about player development as a primary duty. All four coaches spoke about the components of player development which were: establishing personal goals and objectives, technical training, physical training, breaking down game or practice film, and giving feedback about performance. Sidney mentioned that player development was one of the three most important tasks of the job. Team training and session planning during the championship season was considered a main priority - a *glass ball*. It wasn't something she was willing to delegate – "I always write the training sessions during the season – it's a glass ball...I always have my hand on that, and I'm always driving what we're doing technically and tactically." Charlie mentioned the amount of time spent on coaching tasks – "Yeah, I mean it's generally practices and training and schedules and competing because, like I said, that's where you are invested with your players. I would say in a season it's 75 percent [of your time]."

The second lower-order theme under tasks was indirect coaching tasks. These included the following summary codes: recruiting, talent identification, and red flags. Each coach spoke about recruiting as a primary task of the job. Three of four coaches spoke about recruiting players that would fit within the existing framework of the team and were talented enough to compete at the DI level. Two coaches said that it was important to be able to identify talent that went beyond the player resume. Pat recognized that finding players required having an eye for talent and an understanding of how the player would fit into the coach's system:

So, you can't just go recruit off of resumes you have to really have an eye for the talent and understand what you want your team to look like and if that player [can] fit. Now, I think we've had a lot of success over the years finding those players that weren't the most well-known, but we knew they would come in and do a good job and get four years better (Pat).

When asked about the amount of time spent on primary tasks, the participants were unanimous in the view that recruiting the right kids for your program was undoubtedly the area in which most time was spent. Finley said that 50% of the job was recruiting – “I’m always watching and evaluating and making calls trying to find the kids.” He commented on the amount of time spent filtering through a large recruiting database and vetting those that were at the top of the list. The term he used for vetting was “red flags.” Finley spoke in detail about what constituted red flags. In summary, he spoke of poor behavior between recruit and parents, coaches, or officials; and poor behavior displayed to current team while on an official visit. He attributed age and experience to his ability to identify and avoid red flags as illustrated by the following comment: “...when I was younger (I was even more stupid), I would think, ‘here’s a bad kid. I’ll get ‘em

here, work my magic, and change them...As you get older, you start to realize that doesn't happen."

Three of four coaches mentioned that recruiting was critical to having a good program. Conversely, they also said that a good program helps recruiting. This conundrum was evident with the majority of the coaches. Pat said, "If I come in here in two or three years and I'm not winning, ...I'm still not going to get those top kids because we're not winning." Finley echoed, "You need good players to have a good program. We need a good program to attract good players." Charlie felt that his season performance could improve with better recruiting. In a posture of self-reflection, he suggested, "recruiting-wise, I probably haven't recruited a high enough caliber player to help us win...have we settled for moderately average players when we could've been more aggressive for higher prominent players?"

Player management was the final summary code under indirect coaching tasks. Player management included the investment of the athlete as a player, student, and person. All four coaches used frequent meetings to check on player well-being, academic progress, and personal matters. Finley expressed the importance of player management – "I thought the more I knew, the better the soccer coach I was...and you get older, and you start to realize that ...player management is a bigger part of your job." Three of the four coaches talked about the difficulties of keeping players happy, especially if they weren't getting a lot of playing time. Two of the coaches spoke about using assistant coaches to help manage players who didn't play much. Finley said, "I think the bottom group sometimes feel like I don't care. [They think] what [they're] doing doesn't add value to the group. I think our volunteer helps with that." Managing the academic side of the student-athlete was also coded with player management. All four coaches alluded to being aware of the athletes' academic issues, and two of the coaches mentioned that they delegated that

portion of the program to their assistant coaches. Additionally, managing the person was coded under player management. All four coaches spoke of having an open-door policy to encourage communication between player and coach. The participants on the whole believed that player management also included discipline when necessary. Two coaches suggested that conflict resolution was a daily task, but there was a broad sense that athlete discipline was not a common occurrence amongst participants.

The final lower-order theme under tasks was occupational tasks. These included the following summary codes: administration, compliance, budgeting, public relations/media, and university employee-specific tasks. All four coaches noted the enormity of occupational tasks and were not highly regarded by the coaches. One coach spoke about email as the predominant administrative task. Pat dedicated his early mornings to answering email. He expressed, "...I get up early and I get in here early and I find that if I can get those couple hours in in the morning before everybody gets here, I'm not interrupted. I can bang that stuff out." Most often mentioned were tasks associated with compliance. Pat said, "You have to log in how many hours of practice every week and then every month and then how many days off, and so all of that. You've got to log in your phone calls..." Two coaches expressed that most of their compliance work was delegated to assistants. Finley stated, "...there's just so much compliance paperwork in triplicate. The great thing is you have assistants and my assistants are right there and they're both good on technology." Three of four coaches mentioned that budgeting was a primary occupational task. One coach said that his ability to maintain his budget was part of his annual evaluation. Pat articulated that budgeting scholarships was a vital component of his tasks – "...you learn how to manage your scholarship money and your recruiting so you don't ever lose too much of the core of your team at one time and have to start over." All four coaches spoke about public relations as

an occupational task. Although there were some negative comments regarding using social media, three coaches reported the necessity of social media for branding and recruiting purposes. One coach said that he felt it was necessary to be present in the community to market the program's brand. Charlie expressed that recruiting and marketing the program was dependent upon being seen in the right circles.

You've got to be very visible. They've got to know who you are. You've got to be seen at the top training centers around the area. If I'm not there, my opponents' staff are there. So, I go out just to be seen in the community (Charlie).

The next summary code under occupational tasks was university employee responsibilities. Two coaches said that they were asked to represent the university. Sidney said that she didn't have to do much advocating for the athletic department, but she often gave speeches on behalf of the university – "...the president of the university [asks me to speak] ...I do a lot with the university." Sidney also felt that it was her responsibility to serve as a university role model and represent the university at the highest standard.

The next high-order theme under the category of job responsibilities was objectives. The two lower-order themes that come together under objectives were: winning and student-athlete experience. There was a sense amongst coaches that winning was always the objective but the reality of winning a championship was complex. In fact, only one coach had ever won a national championship at the DI level. All four participants agreed that winning a national championship was not their only objective. For example, Sidney said: "... it's unfair and unrealistic goal because only one program can do that once a year. And it's very complicated and very difficult with everything that goes into it." When asked about coaching objectives, Finley answered, "just get better every day" and Pat said that he strove to establish excellence. For one coach, these

alternatives to winning stemmed from her understanding of greater purpose. The comment below illustrates how the coach's philosophical point of view has kept her in the coaching profession a long time.

So, what's important to me - and I think why I've been able to last so long in this business - is it's never been about me. And I think if it's a... if you're motivated for the championships you might as well get out. You know. And I'm talking to myself (Sidney).

The next lower-order theme under objectives was student-athlete experience. Student-athlete experience included the summary codes 1) maximizing potential, and 2) special experiences. Sidney said that she felt it was a huge responsibility to make sure her program was organized, her players were being developed, and that the athletes were having a great experience. Charlie mentioned that he liked to create room in the budget to do things that made the players feel like they were getting an elite experience – “I want [the players] to feel like this was as close to professional soccer as it could be, and there were no shortcuts or cutbacks to prevent them from enjoying the experience.” Finley added that a great experience included treating the players well. This meant that the environment should be positive and safe. Soccer should be a “good part of their day, not a bad part of their day.” He also mentioned that every four years he would take his team on an international trip.

Coaching Processes

We now turn to the category, coaching processes. This is in response to the question regarding how coaches achieve their objectives. Two higher-order themes were under coaching processes – philosophy and methods. Philosophy specifically referred to components that provide rationale for decision making. Two lower-order themes emerged from the data: coach leadership philosophy and playing philosophy. Coach leadership philosophy referred to the head

coach's ideas about how to lead players and staff. Summary codes under this theme were leadership style, coaching attitudes, motivation, and player development. Sidney stated that her philosophy was what drove the standards for the program – "...when you drive the culture it's really what is important to this program and to this family... But, most important, to me and my philosophy. So, I have to drive the philosophies that I stand behind every day." Other responses to this question showed varying approaches to leadership. For example, Pat was a detailed, micro manager. He spoke about having his hands in every aspect of the program. Finley, on the other hand, had a more relaxed approach to his leadership style, while Charlie's leadership style was very relational. He mentioned approaching his coach-player relationships by looking through the lens of the player. He questioned, "What does the player want? What does the player need?"

Staying with the summary code of leadership style, this also included how coaches approached leading staff. Each coach stated that one of their purposes was to mentor staff so they could eventually run their own programs. Sidney said, "Everything I do, I try to give to my assistants...It's really important that I'm a mentor and I'm developing [my assistants] and whoever wants to be a head coach someday." Charlie reiterated Sidney's words: "My responsibility as a head coach is to promote good players but empower coaches to be future head coaches." Pat spoke about his willingness to give his staff some autonomy with training sessions. He held feedback sessions about their coaching performance after practice to hold them accountable. He said, "...you just let them run with it, and then afterwards, you kind of have this other session...It's like players, we all want to know how we're doing our job."

Coaching attitudes were consistently expressed under coach leadership philosophy. For example, Sidney spoke about how enthusiasm and hard work drove everything. The following quote illustrates that point: "If I don't wake up every day enthusiastic about the program, how do

I expect anybody else to?” Charlie spoke about the importance of confidence in his position. It was described as a vital component of a coach’s ability to lead a team – “How you portray yourself to the team is crucial [to] their ability to follow you and believe in you.” His coaching attitude also mirrored Sidney, as he referred to having high energy, motivation, and preparation to create the optimal learning environment for players. Part of the coach leadership philosophy also included their ideas about player development. All the participant coaches believed in holistic player development – an approach that included physical development, as well as development of transferable life skills. Pat spoke of the integration of his idea of excellence with holistic player development in the following statement:

You know we talk a lot around our programs about [developing] young student-athletes that are going to get a degree from our university and then go out and make a difference in society – whatever it is you’re doing – you’re gonna make a difference. Some may continue to play soccer. Others may go off with their degree and do something there. Some may be doing something that is socially conscious and community service or whatever. But we want to develop some excellence with the kinds of kids that we’re producing in our program.

Sidney offered a unique thought to player development. Referring specifically to her leadership and communication approach, she changed the idiom *tough love* to *love tough*. This was an intentional change to a former philosophy that no longer worked with current athletes.

I used to tough love first. Now I have to love tough first. I think you have to explain to [the players] why you do what you do and not just say run through that wall. They’re going to say, ‘but why coach?’ Back 10 years ago, they’d just run through the wall (Sidney).

Finley echoed Sidney's response to loving and caring for the athletes. He said, "...I started to realize that it needs to be about [the players]. And I needed to convince them that I care about them. That's when I did my best." All of the coaches seemed to possess this softer side as a genuine tool to enhance player relationships and to develop trust. Finley alluded to the importance of individualizing his approach to the players: "Experience teaches you different tools to handle different players different ways...in my younger days, it was kind of one approach fits all...that doesn't work with [players]." Sidney said she used the athletes' goals for her personal motivation to maximize their potential. She spoke about goals that were not just athletically related, they had to do with academic goals, career goals, or anything that would propel the athlete forward in life. Further, she mentioned the importance of having staff that could also fill that role, as some players do not connect with the head coach in the same manner as assistant coaches.

The next lower-order theme under philosophy was playing philosophy. This referred to the choices about how to play the game. In other words, choices made regarding talent, training, and tactical playing systems. Two summary codes emerged from the data: coach dictates play, and players dictate play. Coach dictates play refers to the coach recruiting players that can fit within a set playing style. Pat spoke about recruiting players that would fit within a playing style – "I have to know what I want my team to look like...stay true to how you want to teach your team to play and then find players and people that will, you know, fit that system" In contrast, Finley believed that talent should determine the style of play. He preferred not to recruit as much by position, but rather find players that were athletes he could develop into great players. Further, it seemed that his approach to playing systems was simplified.

Ultimately, it boils down to: When you have the ball, does your team know what to do with it?...And when the other team has the ball, does your team organize in such a way that you can even win the ball back or prevent the other team from doing what they want to do – whatever system you are playing in (Finley)?

The next higher-order theme under coaching processes was methods. This included specific tactics employed to achieve coaching objectives. There were two lower-order themes: recruiting methods and building culture. Recruiting methods involved strategic decisions about who to recruit, how to recruit them, and where to find them. Summary codes included: budgeting scholarships, financial aid, efficiency in recruiting, knowing your niche, international recruits, and building a recruiting network.

Referring to budgeting scholarships, all of the coaches planned two or three seasons ahead for recruiting, which meant coaches had to be able to predict their future needs and know how to budget in the present and future. Pat spoke of the importance of learning how to use your scholarship money so you can build a team that is good every year. He also alluded to how new coaches often make the mistake of using all of their scholarship money on one recruiting class. Further, Pat said that knowledge of the financial aid system is very advantageous when maximizing the scholarship budget. He had a wealth of experience with maximizing recruiting dollars with exempt funds, which is illustrated below:

...financial aid options are out there, you know, through federal funding. So, I really became a master of that where I could say ‘I’ll give you a thousand dollars soccer money, but you’re getting ten thousand dollars through financial aid.’ And, you know...so, now you’ve done an eleven-thousand-dollar package, and I had to really learn how to put these pieces together (Pat).

Recruiting efficiency stemmed from the idea of how coaches handled selecting and vetting the large number of interested recruits in their database. Finley spoke about the lack of time coaches had to go and watch every recruit that shows interest.

...it's rare a college coach will just go sit out at a game and just casually find the player.

Oh, we don't have time for that...our database, for example, we probably have about a thousand kids when we are [in prime recruiting]. We probably have about 700 to 1000 kids who will have contacted us at some point. We're not going to see 1000 kids in a 14 to 16-month period of time. There's just not enough hours in the day (Finley).

To maintain efficiency, two coaches spoke about knowing which tournaments would have the most players of interest so they could maximize the number of evaluations.

Finley explained his process following a big recruiting tournament. After the tournament he narrowed down his list of recruits considerably. Then he made decisions about who he would contact. He alluded to considering talent level, red flags, the player's ability to fit within the team culture, and the fit with the university. Regarding university culture, three coaches mentioned recruiting players that would work within the niche of the university. Pat said it was important to know your university and know the types of students at the university to help determine proper fit. Finley said that some institutions attracted players that had high academic standards, others attracted players that wanted a family environment, while other institutions tended to draw students due to their warm climate – “establish a niche and find out what works at that particular type of school” (Finley).

The next summary code was international recruiting. Pat specifically expressed his recruiting strategy involved getting international recruits. Pat used international recruiting to bring players in that were not influenced by the winning record of the program. A new coach in

his current position, he spoke about getting wins quickly to build his reputation. He felt that a failing program was unattractive to recruits, so he turned to international recruiting.

The top players had already committed...we're really not going to get the better kids 'til year 2021 or 22. So, we made a conscious decision to look at the best kids that were still available, but to go overseas...We've had to go that route to get our team better quicker...a lot of overseas kids want to come to the states (Pat).

According to Coach Pat, foreign players were less enamored with conference reputation or winning percentages than American players. So, it was worth the time spent forging relationships with international clubs to create a large recruiting pool of foreign national team players that could immediately elevate the program.

Recruiting methods also included building a recruiting network with national clubs. The collegiate coach-club coach relationship was mentioned by three of the participant coaches. Pat advised every young collegiate coach to build rapport with club coaches – “I try to get [my assistants] to develop a network of those club coaches in the areas we're recruiting...because what we're finding is...those club coaches are being paid. They're paid coaches.” Coach Pat explained that paid coaches are expected to help the kids get recruited so they are eager to work with college coaches. Charlie coached local clubs as a means of staying fresh and informed of local talent – “I like to do club coaching because you get an eye on what's coming through locally, stay connected with the next level, and the next generation of players.” He also expressed the importance of relationships with club coaches – “...I feel like one of the biggest parts of my job is making sure that players and club directors of coaching... know who we are and what we're about and that we have a high interest level in their players.”

The next lower-order theme under methods was building culture. Building culture included the following summary codes: setting standards and creating team buy-in. Building culture was a way of imparting the coach's values and philosophy into the DNA of the team. All four coaches spoke about the culture by using phrases like: establishing standards, driving the culture, setting the tone, creating total buy-in, and getting everyone on the same page. Sidney thought that it was her responsibility to drive the culture daily. She believed her team culture was cultivated through hard work, enthusiasm, holding staff and players accountable for decisions, striving to improve, commitment, and by being true to her coaching philosophy. Pat held to the point that he drove the culture by pushing his philosophy of excellence. In the following comment, Pat expressed the importance of communicating the vision to the players and staff, so everyone understood expectations:

The kids have to have what I call 'total buy-in.' You have to know what you you're your team to look like and how to get it there. And I have to know how to communicate that to my players. And if I do a good job of that right from the get-go and get them to buy in to the vision, then you've got them.

Charlie spoke about the advantages of building culture:

...you've got to really establish the culture you want. The culture will overcome anything. You'll overcome drama; you'll overcome a violation; you'll overcome any sort of misdemeanor...the strength of the culture will help that player grow, the team [to] grow.

Further, Charlie believed the culture should include elite training, honest communication with players, and constant improvement from players and staff. He was adamant about not leaving anything to chance, especially the team dynamics. "I never leave it to chance that even though

they are good kids they are going to be good teammates. You can take the best girls, or the best male players and they may never click.” Pat drove the culture by just being present at all team-related events, including strength and conditioning sessions. He said it was essential for the players to believe that everything they were doing was important enough for the coach to be there. Finley’s culture set the standards for training, academic performance, accountability, and established responsibility. He believed in constant culture reinforcement, as well as time spent instructing freshmen how to become part of the team culture. Finley established culture using a variety of methods. He used the upperclassmen as mentors and paired them with younger players to socialize them into the culture. He also held the leaders responsible for governing the team. If there was an issue with a player, he expected the team to try to handle it before he had to step in. He allowed the players to drive the program but ultimately, he felt responsibility for setting the tone. This was illustrated by the following comment:

But I think the mood that we set is one where we expect our best effort. And as long as we get their best effort, we're happy. So, what that means is the first thing I have to [do is] set the tone. So, my first role is I have to set the tone for it - for the program (Finley).

Knowledge Requirements

Knowledge requirements were comprised of two higher order themes: coaching roles and requisite knowledge. Coaching roles were those functions assumed by the coach that may or may not involve direct coaching. The two lower order themes were head coach roles and support staff roles. Summary codes related to head coach roles were: CEO, parent, recruiter, trainer, mentor, life coach, role model, and nutritionist. Each participant coach described themselves as the CEO of their program – “...you’re almost like a CEO of your own company, you know...because you’ve got to have your hands in everything” (Pat). Finley said, “there has to be someone at the

top of the tree who's in charge. Everybody knows who is in charge up my tree. I'm on the top of the tree." Sidney called herself, "the captain" whereas Finley referred to himself as the "boss" and "enforcer." Part of the CEO role was to be a visible representative. Charlie described himself as being the face of the program. He commented on being purposely visible in the community to brand the program, whereas Pat did much of his branding work on social media – "I really have gotten heavily involved in Twitter...just trying to get our program out there, get our university out there, get our coaches out there..."

In contrast to the CEO role, coaches also played the role of parent to their players. Each coach said they felt like they had a parental role. Finley jokingly said that sometimes his players loved him and sometimes they hated him – "...sometimes I feel like I've got 27 daughters." Ultimately, the role included connecting with players and ensuring that trust was being established. Coaches' roles were certainly about helping young student-athletes maximize their potential on many levels, whether on the field or in the classroom. Charlie described himself as a mentor – "These are 18 and 21-year-olds that, hopefully, will trust you...90% [of the job is about] player relationships." Sidney echoed Charlie's sentiments. She called her job an "incredible opportunity to be a life coach." She also called herself an emotional psychologist and cheerleader, as well as a role model.

In a more direct coaching capacity, each coach served as the top trainer – driving the playing and training philosophy. Sidney mentioned her role as a strength and conditioning coach, as well as a nutritionist, despite having support staff for these positions. Finally, each coach had a huge recruiting role. When handing out scholarships to recruits, Sidney said that was her direct role. Anytime money was discussed, she considered that a glass ball, not something to delegate.

The second lower-order theme was support staff roles. Support staff involved both the coaching staff and athletic department support staff. All coaches referred to the following positions as support staff: assistant coaches, directors of operations, athletic trainers, nutritionists, strength and conditioning coaches, sports information directors, academic advisors, business office staff, and compliance officers. Three participant coaches had two full-time assistant coaches, as well as an additional part time or volunteer coach. One program had one full-time assistant coach. Summary codes within this theme included: administration, compliance, recruiting, and training. Coaching staff were involved in nearly every component of the program but were often delegated to administration and compliance duties. Further, coaching staff were helpful recruiters. Since this context tended to draw large levels of recruit interest, the workload was heavy. Sidney named one of her assistant coaches “head of recruiting.” Assistant coaches also served as trainers. Pat spoke about delegating portions of training to staff, and specifically mentioned the importance of assistants training the non-starters – “I’m really training two teams when the season starts.” Other support staff associated with the teams were the athletic trainer, strength and conditioning coach, and social media correspondent. Finley mentioned that the athletic trainer helped players with rehabilitation, recovery, and physical well-being. Further, they were often the people that players talked to about personal matters.

[The] trainer tends to be like the agony aunt...the trainer knows everything that goes on in the team. They know whose boyfriend broke up with them and whose girlfriend broke up with them...whose fighting with their parents. You know sometimes kids just need someone to just listen. So, the trainer will have a big part in that (Finley).

Coach Finley also expressed how the social media correspondent helped with the player experience.

Our social media is a sports information person... the kids today love social media... she's able to relate to the kids...the players are in the middle of it. [If you make it about] the players, and if you make it about their experience, I think that's when you get the most out of them.

Within the athletic department on the administrative side, coaches spoke about how they had to work with academic advisors, business office staff, and compliance officers. These roles were specific to their titles: Academic advisors were responsible for creating student course schedules and grade reporting; business office staff were in charge of working with coaches on their finances; and compliance officers were responsible for ensuring all of the paperwork was correct, within the legalities of NCAA rules, and turned in on time. They also had the role of confirming player eligibility and academic progress.

The next higher order theme under knowledge requirements was requisite knowledge for DI. This theme included the types of knowledge necessary to do the job, specifically, in the NCAA DI FBS context. There were four lower-order themes: professional knowledge, occupational knowledge, interpersonal knowledge, and intrapersonal knowledge. Professional knowledge included the following summary codes: sport science, sport psychology, and training theory. Regarding sport science, two of the four coaches spoke of the need to know about periodization, rest, and recovery. The need for sport psychology knowledge was mentioned by three of the four coaches. Confidence, motivation, communication, and emotional regulation were three areas mentioned in reference to sport psychology. Charlie spoke about having complete confidence in his ability to be an effective coach at this level. He thought it was important for a coach to know how to project confidence to his players – “How you portray yourself to the team is crucial to their ability to follow you and believe in you.” All four coaches

spoke about player motivation. Pat said, “find out how to tap into what makes them tick...because you have to have what I call ‘total buy-in’.” Two coaches spoke about the connection between good communication and motivation. Pat spoke about individualizing the message. Charlie spoke about having three daughters of his own and the importance of treating each one differently.

I’m a better coach because I am a parent...I’ve got three daughters and I’ve got to talk to them all differently. One of them I can tell her face-to-face, the other one I’ve got to tell her in the sweetest way possible. Another one, I’m just brutally honest (Charlie).

Finley used his coaching objective, “just get better every day,” as a motivational tool. He believed that if he overshot team objectives, players would get discouraged when they realized they couldn’t accomplish them and they would stop investing energy. He said, “I genuinely feel if you set yourself up for [failure], the kids today [are] wired differently. They will just say, ‘well we can’t achieve that now, so let’s take all that energy there and put it somewhere else.’” Charlie viewed his primary responsibility as inspiring and motivating players and staff.

I’ve got to inspire my players to be better...I’ve got to inspire my staff. I’ve got to be motivated. I’ve got to be high energy. I have got to be excitable because when players arrive every day, they mostly come from class. They are tired...they’ve already gone through a long day. They’re looking at you, as a coach, to be that prominent leader that’s like, ‘it’s soccer; it’s fun; it’s enjoyable; it’s competitive; it’s challenging. I don’t have any other task that I feel is as important as every day, I’ve got to bring it.

The last finding relating to sport psychology knowledge was emotional regulation. Charlie and Sidney used emotional regulation to portray a desired attitude. Charlie mentioned always being prepared and having great energy. He felt like his energy could impact player performance.

Therefore, he deliberately showed high energy during practices and games even if he didn't feel energetic. He said, "When the players arrive, I am upbeat, cheerful, excited, animated, passionate, energetic because they're gonna live off that." Sidney was similar. She felt like her enthusiasm drove the culture – "You know, my big thing is enthusiasm gets you places. So, if I don't wake up every day enthusiastic about the program, how do I expect anybody else to?"

Finley used emotional regulation in a different way. Sometimes he showed emotion deliberately and sometimes he showed restraint. He used these methods of control to motivate or to achieve a desired response. For example, when he didn't feel like the players were performing to his standards he would, "have a go at them." This meant there would be some level of ridicule to get the players back on track.

Moving to the next summary code, training theory was discussed by all the coaches.

Sidney referred to the level of complexities in writing a training plan with the following quote:

... there's a lot that goes in [a training plan] and then just, you know, a piece of paper and YouTube. A great session has to have purpose. It has to be effective and [it] has to be have high performance but high recovery (Sidney).

Pat commented on context-specific training. He expressed the importance of having a strength and conditioning coach that was knowledgeable of soccer fitness. His prior experience with strength and conditioning coaches that were only versed in football made him cautious about who was involved in conditioning his players. He said, "...fortunately the guy we have is all over that, and he is well versed in everything I threw at him about modern trends."

In response to the question about what a DI coach has to know to perform the job, the lower-order theme - occupational knowledge - emerged. Occupational knowledge referred to the types of knowledge outside the sport context. The following summary codes were used under

this theme: administration, hiring staff, managing support staff, budgeting and accounting, compliance, recruiting, marketing and branding, and prioritizing tasks. Sidney described herself as a manager of people. She said that hiring staff and conflict resolution were key things to know for DI coaches. She and Pat spoke about knowing how to resolve conflict. Pat said putting out fires was part of his job. Sidney had the same opinion— “You know you can’t be afraid of confrontation. ...every day you have to deal with conflict when you deal with human beings...I don’t run a dictatorship here, so there’s a lot of agreeing to disagree.” All four coaches said that administration was part of their job, as well as knowing about compliance and the rules for recruiting. Charlie said administrative work was the area in which he felt the least prepared to do. This was illustrated in the following statement:

I felt like that I was prepared with years of coaching experience, years of coaching different levels, different types of players boys, girls, older, younger, pro-level, playing at a high level. So, it I felt like I built up a coaching resume. What I didn't have [on] this coaching resume was administrative duties that really, I needed to understand - Monday through Friday...who I needed to be seeing or what I needed to be doing and signing off on (Charlie).

Regarding budgeting and accounting, two coaches expressed the need for this to be part of coaching education. One coach said his budget was part of his annual evaluation. Pat spoke about the nuances of budgeting scholarships as being challenging for new coaches to learn on their own. Regarding marketing and branding, all four coaches discussed this as important to their work. Charlie alluded to being conscious of branding in the following comment:

I'll probably go to five or six local clubs to talk about college recruiting the process so getting my face out there getting the schools brand out there, getting our name out there

is important. So...I never think at this job you switch off - you switch off, you lose (Charlie).

Prioritizing tasks was the final summary code under occupational knowledge. Sidney described prioritizing tasks as a means to balance the most important things in her work and life with those that were less important. She used the analogy of juggling glass balls and rubber balls. She distinguished which tasks were priority – these were glass balls. Those that were less of a priority were the rubber balls – ones she was willing to drop. She illustrated that point with the statement below:

...it's very hard for me. You know, it's funny. I try to...you know, I have three children at home, too, and then I have to recruit. And again, here goes glass balls/rubber balls. So, I always try to do something for the university once a year and then I have obligations to [X] Athletic Club. So, I'm always trying to balance all that.

Interpersonal knowledge was the next lower theme. This included the following summary codes: communication, relationships, and trust. Interpersonal knowledge involved the social interactions between coaches, athletes, and support staff. Finley showed the necessity of interpersonal knowledge by the frequency he met with his players. He had a strong conviction about the importance of relationships and trust. He felt like he had to be approachable so players would want to come talk with him. Charlie spoke about the importance of building trusting relationships with his staff. He said that coaches have to know how to trust and delegate in order to get more accomplished and to allow assistants an opportunity to grow.

The last lower-order theme under requisite knowledge for DI was intrapersonal knowledge, which used the summary codes, reflection, understanding purpose, and self-awareness. Pat and Sidney spoke about the use of reflection to assess their coaching knowledge

and performance to determine their professional growth needs. All of the participant coaches alluded to their desire to learn more. Finley was reflective of his coaching tenure. He said, "... I look back now of me as a younger coach...Oh my God...I'm embarrassed by some of the things I did and said." Yet, this reflective activity allowed coaches to develop wisdom and a sense of greater purpose. Sidney and Finley spoke about understanding purpose. Sidney kept her philosophy player-centered – "it's never about me." She went on to give a statement of purpose – "it's the weddings that matter and not the championships," speaking to the idea of keeping the focus on the players and staff and real life, and less focus on outcomes. Finley echoed that attitude. He expressed that coaches should not get hung up on wins and losses. He was clear about being purposeful in giving the players an overall positive collegiate experience.

Job Challenges

Under this heading there was one higher-order theme, DI job challenges. Two lower-order themes were generated: coaching challenges and occupational challenges. Coaching challenges produced the following summary codes: adapting to Generation Z and recruiting. By far, the biggest coaching challenge stemmed from adapting to Generation Z athletes. Three of four coaches said they had to understand how to coach players that were very different than a decade ago. Pat said that Generation Z players lacked toughness and a competitive drive. He referred to overbearing helicopter parents who contributed to the inability for players to handle conflict and adversity. He suggested that players were less mature than those of prior generations, and there seemed to be a greater need to employ more psychologists for students in and out of a sport context. Because of these traits in Generation Z, Coach Pat found it challenging to recruit players that he wanted.

The biggest challenge for us in the recruiting process is there are so many good kids that have gone through growing up where they've kind of been given so much; they've been given everything, and when things didn't go their way, they weren't forced to handle those issues themselves. Mom and Dad took care of it (Pat).

Sidney and Finley also spoke about the coaching challenges of Generation Z – "...kids today, they're different. Players today – male or female – there has to be a why..." (Finley). Coach Sidney confirmed the need for more explanation to Generation Z players in the following quote:

This generation [is different] than 20 years ago...you have to explain to them why you do what you do and not just say run through that wall. They're going to say, 'but why coach?' Back 10 years ago, they'd just run through the wall.

Finley said that new players think about the coach differently. Coach expertise did not guarantee a motivation to perform. He said that new players are motivated when demands were personally beneficial. He explained that coaches had to clarify how the team would benefit from a particular request, but it was just as important that the player personally benefit. Doing things for the good of the team was not a primary motivator.

The age of social media and its impact on Generation Z was also concerning for the participant coaches. Pat said that the current generation was very high on digital communication. Whereas 10 years ago, coaches might receive letters expressing interests from recruits, now it is more about personal web pages, text messaging, and email. Sidney said that players were so distracted by technology and social media that it presented challenges in terms of getting players to focus. Coaching focused was also a challenge as mentioned by one coach:

You recruit players who are two or three years down the road before you even get them. So, in one task you've got one eye on your current season. You've got your eye on the

future seasons, and sometimes you never really get to coach the team that you build because you're always on to the next player, the next team, the next era (Charlie).

The second lower-order theme under DI job challenges was occupational challenges. These referred to non-coaching challenges of the job, which included the following summary codes: work-life balance, social media, and organizational power. Three coaches mentioned the heavy workload and long hours of the job. Therefore, one occupational challenge was maintaining a work-life balance. Two coaches spoke about the impact of their work on the family. Sidney mentioned having kids at home and balancing decisions between work and family. Charlie gave an example of going out to dinner with his spouse and using the salt and pepper shakers and sugar packets to walk through a playing system. After working it out, he asked his wife, "What do you make of this formation?" She said, "just put the sugar away. Put the salt away." He said, "you never switch off" (Charlie).

Next, Pat felt that social media presented a challenge for coaches. He said it was necessary to use social media for sending messages and branding the program, but it was hard to see critical feedback from the public – "...people are free to tell you how good you are, how bad you are...what kind of an idiot you are for making this decision or that decision. So, you have to have an understanding of how to cope with that."

Finally, the last summary code under occupational challenges was organizational power. This referred to the impact of winning on influence within the athletic organization. Charlie said winning gave him influence in the department. He believed that winning games would allow his vision for the program to be realized and supported with administration. This was illustrated in the following statement:

You can have a lot of great ideas and you can have a lot of great concepts of what you want to do, but ultimately to get people to buy-in - your superiors, your bosses, your players, your staff – you’ve got to have short term successful results. I could have some fantastic long-term ideas, but if I go 0-6, I’m not going to be around long enough to introduce those ideas (Charlie).

Coach Learning

Coach Learning referred to the last research question regarding how head coaches’ experiences of their professional work contributed to coaching education and development. Two higher-order themes under this heading were produced: learning modes and moving forward. Learning modes described all the mechanisms that coaches used to learn to do their job, which produced four lower-order themes: professional coach development, occupational learning, informal learning, and non-formal learning. Professional coach development included the following summary codes: professional licensure, formal coach learning, and unmediated professional development. All four coaches spoke of the professional licensure experiences with the United States Soccer Federation (USSF), National Soccer Coaches Association of America/United Soccer Coaches (NSCAA/USC), and/or the Union of European Football Association (UEFA).

Each participant coach had achieved multiple advanced U.S. coaching licenses (e.g. USSF “A” or “B” and NSCAA/USC Advanced National, Premier, or Master Coach Diplomas). Three of the participants even had high-level international coaching licenses (e.g. UEFA “A”). Attitudes about these coaching courses were generally positive. Pat saw the evolution of the U.S. coaching licensure system. When he went through the process (back in the 1990s), he said the courses were very technical and tactical-focused but have grown into including more of the exercise

sciences (e.g. periodization) and sport psychology. According to Pat, the UEFA system used to be much more challenging and professional than the U.S. system. He described a typical 10-day U.S. Soccer licensure course including classroom and field activity on various subjects. He mentioned that each coach was evaluated twice on their ability to teach a subject. However, he criticized the program for not giving any feedback to the coaches— "...the instructor watched you but there was no feedback. There was nothing. You didn't know until a few months later when they'd mail you the results, you know, whether you passed or failed." He did mention that things have changed for the better.

I think now they're videotaping and mic'ing up all the coaches...they are doing more teaching in the week now than they did before...with the B and A license, they'll fly into your area and see you with your team and give you a bit more personal feedback. It's a bit more extensive now (Pat).

Pat described the UEFA system as more professional and intense. Each coach received a full kit (uniform) to wear and they were assigned a team to coach. He explained that in the U.S. system, the candidates coached each other. Pat was negative about that because some coaches were 60 years old and others were 20 years old. He expressed how coaches were training like elite athletes despite their fitness levels – "[At UEFA] you actually had a team, and the coaches could just stand and watch while you did your practice so you weren't getting beat up...it was very professionally done and we got more teaching opportunities." Finley said that growing up in Europe provided a rich soccer culture. He grew up playing the game and admitted being skeptical about formal coaching education. He thought that being a good player would equate to being a good coach – "you know I was a fast horse so therefore; I'd be a great jockey...really, my eyes were opened. Teaching the game and knowing the game were night and day." He

developed an appreciation for formal coach education and went through both U.S.S.F. and NSCAA/USC coaching licensure systems. Charlie was adamant that all coaches should be engaged in professional coach development. Further, he thought it should be a job requirement to advance in coaching licensure. He said that “coaches have an obligation to improve.” One of the challenges to formal coaching education, according to Sidney, was the amount of time required for working professionals to achieve advanced licenses. She explained that the U.S. system required nearly two-weeks away from family and job. She expressed this as a personal challenge: “But to be away from my family for two weeks, or whatever it is now, is tough. I can’t afford that yet, but I’d love to do it. It’s just too much time away” (Sidney). Sidney spoke about turning to unmediated professional development. She required herself to do one professional development event per year. She spoke about visiting other institutions’ athletic programs to observe operations, working U.S. Soccer National Team Camps, and attending a friend’s leadership conference. She also accepted opportunities for speaking engagements and welcomed the feedback from faculty and/or attendees:

For example, the university asked me to do this. They’re having a leadership conference. They asked me to speak. So, to get in front of that community was very difficult for me because you know, it’s different – it’s not my athlete...and I got hammered on my PowerPoint and my technology and all of that. But it was excellent because I always just take feedback – good or bad – as a growing opportunity (Sidney).

The next lower-order theme was occupational learning. This comprised the ways in which coaches learned how to do administration, human resource management, athletic department duties, compliance, and program management – all non-coaching specific job components. Summary codes under this category were: face to face meetings, trial and error, and

career pathway. Charlie learned the occupation by meeting with all support staff personnel face to face. When he was first hired, he designated a two-week period to meet with everybody regarding each department's expectations of him. So, he learned by simply talking with people and establishing a rapport.

I just sat down and said, 'walk me through what you need from me. Here's what I want you to do. Do you see any roadblocks or obstacles?'...I didn't want to email anybody. I didn't want to have a phone call. I wanted to meet directly with the person (Charlie).

Sidney mentioned that there was no formal education for the required occupational tasks of the job. She said she learned over time by trial and error. Her accumulated knowledge was developed by making a lot of mistakes. Finley mentioned the mistakes he made as a young coach. Over time, he learned not repeat past practices. For example, his recruiting knowledge and his method of looking for "red flags" was not a textbook strategy, but rather a skill developed over time that has helped build his team culture. Two of the four coaches had career pathways that progressed toward NCAA DI, while the other two had always coached at DI. Pat had been at nearly every level from high school to professional. He worked in the NAIA collegiate division and even started his own program. Pat said that the time spent in various positions within the collegiate system, helped him to learn about administration, compliance, financial aid, and ways to get stretch your recruiting budget. Additionally, he spoke of learning the occupational nuances from the ground up.

I started as a young coach with the NAIA level, and before I got my first DI full-time job, I had to wear all the hats. You know, I had to mow my field, line my field. I had to put the nets up before games. You did everything, you know. You didn't have a maintenance crew that took care of it; you didn't have game management people that handled making

sure you got an ambulance and trainers and doctors...so, I think it's a really good learning tool for young coaches to have to go through that – wearing more of those hats to understand and appreciate (Pat).

The next lower-order theme under learning modes was informal learning. Summary codes within informal learning were: familial influences, learning by cumulative experience, and learning by watching the game. Each coach participant said that they learned the job over time without help from formal coach education. Like Pat, Charlie built a robust coaching resume by coaching boys and girls, a variety of ages, and also coaching at the professional level. Two coaches spoke about learning through familial experience. In particular, Sidney spoke about the strong women in her family that influenced her leadership ability – “I was very fortunate that I saw women lead at a very young age...I had this aunt that was incredible. I had this mother figure that was incredible. I had a grandmother that was incredible.” She also mentioned her brother and father, and male coaches that were significant in shaping her competitive nature. Further, she explained how her time as an athlete shaped her coaching.

I played every sport you could play...I had all sorts of coaches...and then I went to college and I had this incredible coach who was a...gentleman...[he] showed me...just what you could do in an environment that was safe, loving, tough, but motivational. I was very fortunate (Sidney).

Likewise, Charlie used his athletic experiences in his coaching. He reflected on his days playing U10 soccer when he had an uninspiring coach. He said he would be either inspired or deflated by the people that were running the session. Because of those early athletic experiences, he said he always maintained an enthusiastic attitude and created an engaging learning environment in his coaching practice.

Finally, coaches learned by watching the game. Two coaches mentioned watching matches during the week to stay sharp. Charlie said he watched games daily or weekly – “I’ll record ten or twelve matches a week. I’ll watch three or four from an enjoyment standpoint...then I watch the same three or four from a learning standpoint” (Charlie). He also spoke of watching non-soccer sports as a way to bring new ideas into his practice.

The next higher-order theme under the category coach learning was moving forward. This category was in response to the question regarding what DI coaches should know about working in this context and what advice would you give to future DI coaches. Two lower-order themes were generated: enhancing curriculum and advice. Under enhancing curriculum, the following raw data snippets from Sidney displayed her ideas about what coaches should know in the DI context: How to start a college program, hiring staff, recruiting the right kid, player development, setting standard consistent with your philosophy, understanding your purpose, and maximizing potential. Pat added that coaching education should be contextualized. Therefore, his suggestions were coded in the following way: sport science and periodization, sport psychology, administration, conflict resolution, accounting and budgeting, marketing and branding, and compliance.

The next lower-order theme was advice. Advice included words of wisdom from the coaches about how future coaches can prepare for work in a collegiate setting. Raw data snippets from Finley showed his advice: convince players you care; don’t try to be anyone else, figure out your recruiting niche, hold to your standards, player buy-in is more important than sport knowledge, be patient, expertise takes time, and enjoy the job. Raw data snippets from Charlie showed his advice: find sources of encouragement, don’t be afraid to change or grow, and work hard to find helpful resources. Raw data snippets from Pat displayed his advice: establish a

coaching philosophy, find a mentor, and have consistent behavior. Raw data snippets from Sidney included: surround yourself with good people, have a greater sense of purpose, it's about the relationships not the wins, and work hard.

Conclusion

In summary, the present study uncovered what coaches thought about their professional work. There were many aspects of their job that were germane to the overall coaching profession (e.g. direct coaching tasks), but the level of resources, the occupational components of their job, the time spent recruiting, and the mixed coaching roles, (particularly the role of CEO), indicated that the job within the NCAA DI FBS context was highly complex. The nuances of the coaching occupation within this context necessitated more than professional knowledge (e.g. technical/tactical, physical, psychological) but needed an alchemy of knowledge including human resource management, leadership, conflict resolution, accounting, and interpersonal communication, to name a few. Passion and enthusiasm for the work was not lost on this coaching sample. Despite job challenges, coaches spoke positively about their work experiences and felt a great sense of purpose. In the words of Pat, "I just have never really looked at it as a job because I'm really passionate about what I do, and I just love doing it."

This study also looked at the ways in which coaches learned to do their jobs. Primarily, coaches utilized informal methods like learning through experience, although this sample also engaged in formal training through U.S. and international licensure programs. However, these opportunities focused more on the professional knowledge and less on occupational knowledge. Moving forward in coaching education and learning to do the work in a DI context, coaches offered advice on what coaches need to know and what might be valuable in a coaching curriculum unique to this population of coaches.

APPENDIX G

Extended Reference List

- Abraham, A., Collins, D. & Martindale, R. (2006). The coaching schematic: Validation through expert coach consensus, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(6), 549-564. doi: 10.1080/02640410500189173
- Abraham, A., & Collins, D. (1998). Examining and extending research in coach development. *Quest*, 50(1), 59-79. doi: 10.1080/00336297.1998.10484264
- Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals and the classroom motivational climate. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student Perceptions in the Classroom* (p. 327–348). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Aspen Institute Project Play (2018). Sport participation and physical activity rates. Retrieved from <https://www.aspenprojectplay.org/kids-sports-participation-rates/>
- Barber, H., & Eckrich, J. (1998). Methods and criteria employed in the evaluation of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 301-322. doi: 10.1123/jsm.12.4.301
- Bayles, M. D. (1988). *Professional Ethics* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.
- Becker, A. J. (2009). It's not what they do, it's how they do it: Athlete experiences of great coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(1), 93-119. doi: 10.1260/1747-9541.4.1.93
- Becker, A. J. & Wrisberg, C. A. (2008). Effective coaching in action: Observations of legendary collegiate basketball coach Pat Summit. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22, 197-211. doi: 10.1123/tsp.22.2.197

- Bernard, H. R., & Ryan, G. (1998). Text analysis. In H. R. Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, 613. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Bompa, T. O. (1994). *Theory and methodology of training: the key to athletic performance*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
- Borrie, A., & Knowles, Z. (2003). Coaching science and soccer. In T. Reilly & M. Williams (Eds.), *Science and Soccer* (p. 187). London, Routledge.
- Bowes, I., & Jones, R. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 235 - 245. doi: 10.1123/tsp.20.2.235
- Campone, F. (2014). Thinking like a professional: The impact of graduate coach education. *International Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 5(2), 1-18. doi: 10.1002/jpoc.21142
- Carolina (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://goheels.com/staff.aspx?staff=219>
- Cassidy, T., Jones, R. L. & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Chelladurai, P. (1999). *Human Resource Management in Sport and Recreation*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL
- Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(1), 255-262. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss1/16>
- Cooper, D. & Allen, J. B. (2017). The coaching process of the expert coach: A coach led approach. *Sport Coaching Review*, 1-29. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2017.1361168

- Côté, J. (2006). The development of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 1(3), 217-222. doi: 10.1260/174795406778604609
- Côté, J. & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching*, 4(3), 307 - 323. doi: 10.1260/174795409789623892
- Côté, J., Salmela, J. H., Baria, A., & Russell, S. J. (1993). Organizing and interpreting unstructured qualitative data. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7(2), 127-137.
- Côté, J., Salmela, J., & Russell, S. (1995). The knowledge of high-performance gymnastic coaches: methodological framework. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 65-75.
- Côté, J., Salmela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A. & Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1123/jsep.17.1.1
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications.
- Cross, N., & Ellice, C. (1997). Coaching effectiveness and the coaching process: Field hockey revisited. *Scottish Journal of Physical Education*, 25, 19-33.
- Cross, N., & Lyle, J. (Eds.). (1999). *The Coaching Process: Principles and Practice for Sport*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Culver, D.M., & Trudel, P. (2006). Cultivating coaches' communities of practice: Developing the potential for learning through interactions. In *The Sports Coach as Educator* (pp. 115-130). London: Routledge.
- Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, 55, 215-230. doi: 10.10/00336297.2003.10491800

- Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Locating the coaching process in practice: Models 'for' and 'of' coaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(1), 83-99. doi: 10.1080/17408980500466995
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (pp. 146-166). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Strategies of inquiry. *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 367-378). London: Sage.
- Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2005). Perspectives on work-family conflict in sport: an integrated approach. *Sport Management Review*, 8(3), 227-253. doi: 10.1016/S1441-3523(05)70040-1
- Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(3), 377-406. doi: 10.1123/jsm.21.3.377
- Duffy, P., Bales, J., Crespo, M., & Dick, F., Vardhan, D., Nordmann, L., & Curado, J. (2011). Sport coaching as a 'profession': challenges and future directions. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 5(2), 93-123.
- Drake, D. B. (2008). Finding our way home: coaching's search for identity in a new era. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16-27. doi: 10.1080/175218880801906099
- Entwistle, N. J., & Peterson, E. R. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education: Relationships with study behavior and influences of learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 41(6), 407-428. doi: 10.1016/j.ijer.2005.08.009

- Erickson, K., Côté, J., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2007). Sport experiences, milestones, and educational activities associated with high-performance coaches' development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21(3), 302-316. doi: 10.1123/tsp.21.3.302
- Fairs, J. R. (1987). The coaching process: The essence of coaching. *Sports Coach*, 11(1), 17-19.
- Fleishman, E. A., Quaintance, M. K., & Broedling, L. A. (1984). *Taxonomies of Human Performance: The Description of Human Tasks*. Academic Press.
- Franks, I., Sinclair, G., Thomson, W. & Goodman, D. (1986) Analysis of the coaching process. *Science, Periodical, Research Technology and Sport*, 1, 1-12.
- Gallimore, R. & Tharp, R. (2004). What a coach can teach a teacher, 1975 – 2004: Reflections and reanalysis of John Wooden's teaching practices. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 119 – 137.
- Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (1999). Framing the construction of coaching knowledge in experiential learning theory. *Sociology of Sport Online*, 2(1).
<http://physed.otago.ac.nz/sosol/v2il/v2il.htm>
- Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2000). Validation of the Coaching Model (CM) in a team sport context. *International Sports Journal*, 4(2), 120-128.
- Gilbert, W., Côté, J., & Mallett, C. (2006). Developmental pathways and activities of successful sport coaches. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 1, 69-76.
<https://doi.org/10.1260/174795406776338526>
- Gilbert, W., & Côté, J. (2013). Defining coaching effectiveness: A focus on coaches' knowledge. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert, & J. Denison (Eds). *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching* (pp.147-159). London: Routledge.

- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field methods*, 18, 59-82.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://methods.sagepub.com/book/applied-thematic-analysis>.
<http://dxdoi.org/10.4.135/9781483384436>
- Harvey, S., Voelker, D. K., Cope, E., & Dieffenbach, K. (2017). Navigating the leadership labyrinth: barriers and supports of a woman collegiate coach in a 20-year leadership role. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-18. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2017.1353232
- International Council for Coaching Excellence (2013). *International Sport Coaching Framework* (v1.2). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- International Council for Coaching Excellence (2000). *Magglingen Declaration*. Retrieved from https://www.icce.ws/_assets/files/documents/Magglingen.pdf.
- Jenny, S. (2007). Coaching effectiveness in NCAA D-1 and II distance running. *Track Coach*, 181, 5787 - 5794.
- Jones, R. L. (2009). Coaching as caring (the smiling gallery): Accessing hidden knowledge. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14(4), 377-390.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980801976551>
- Jones, R. L., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 8(2), 213-229.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320309254>

- Jones, R. L., & Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: Coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10, 119-134.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332052000308792>
- Langsdorf, E. V. (1979). *A systematic observation of football coaching behavior in a major university environment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Lara-Bercial, S., & Mallett, C. J. (2016). The practices and developmental pathways of professional and Olympic serial winning coaches. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 3, 221-239. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2016-0083>
- Lyle, J. W. B. (1998). *The Coaching Process*. Leeds: National Coaching Foundation.
- Lyle, J. W. B. (1999). The Coaching process: principles and practice. In N. Cross, J. Lyle, (Eds.), *The Coaching Process: Principles and Practice for Sport*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behavior*. London: Routledge.
- Lyle, J. W. B. (2010). Coaches' decision making: A naturalistic decision-making analysis, In: *Sports Coaching: Professionalization and Practice* (pp. 27-42). Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.
- Lyle, J. (2018). Reflecting on the conceptual framework for sport coaching. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 5, 90-98. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2017-0085>
- Lyle, J., & Cushion, C. (2010). Narrowing the field; some key questions for sports coaching. In J. Lyle & C. Cushion (Eds.), *Sports Coaching Professionalization and Practice* (pp. 243–252). London: Elsevier.

- Lyle, J., Mallett, C., Trudel, P., & Rynne, S. (2009). Formal vs. informal coach education: A response to commentaries. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(3), 359 - 364. <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795409789623883>
- Maclean, J.C. & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Dimensions of coaching performance: development of a scale. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 194-207.
- Mallett, C. J., & Lara-Bercial, S. (2016). Serial winning coaches: people, vision, and environment. In *Sport and Exercise Psychology Research*, (pp. 289-322). <https://doi.org/10.1016/8978-0-12-803634-1.00014-5>
- Mallett, C. J., Rynne, S. B., & Dickens, S. (2013). Developing high performance coaching craft through work and study. In: P. Potrac, W. Gilbert, & J. Denison (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching* (pp. 463-475). London: Routledge.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. 2000. Competing models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Human Intelligence* (pp. 396–420). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCullick, B. A., Belcher, D., & Schempp, P. G. (2005). What works in coaching and sport instructor certification programs? The participants' view. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 10(2), 121-137. doi: doi.org/10.1080/17408980500105015
- McDonald, M. G., & Birrell, S. (1999). Reading sport critically: A methodology for interrogating power. *Sociology of sport journal*, 16(4), 283-300. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.16.4.283>
- McKay, J., Gore, J. M., & Kirk, D. (1990). Beyond the limits of technocratic physical education. *Quest*, 42(1), 52-76.
- Middlehurst, R. (1995). Changing leadership in universities. *The changing university*, 75-92.

- Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. (1994). *Teaching physical education* (4th ed.), New York: Macmillan.
- NCAA (2018a). *About the NCAA: Division I*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about?division=d1>.
- NCAA (2018b). *About the NCAA: Resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/leadership-development/coaches>.
- NCAA (2019). *How the NCAA works*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/champion/how-ncaa-works>.
- NCAA (2019b). The marketplace: Careers in collegiate athletics. Retrieved from <https://ncaamarket.ncaa.org/jobs>
- Nelson, L., Cushion, C., & Potrac, P. (2013). Enhancing the provision of coach education: The recommendations of UK coach practitioners. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 18(2), 204-218. doi: 10.1080/17408989.2011.649725
- O'Sullivan, M., & Doutis, P. (1994). Research on expertise: Guideposts for expertise and teacher education in physical education. *Quest*, 46(2), 176-185.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019372396020004005>
- Poggenpoel, M., & Myburgh, S. (2003). The researcher as research instrument in educational research: A possible threat to trustworthiness? *Education*, 124(2), 418-21, 320.
- Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R., Armour, K., & Hoff, J. (2000). Toward an holistic understanding of the coaching process. *Quest*, 52(2), 186-199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2000.10491709>

- Potrac, P., Jones, R., & Armour, K. (2002). 'It's all about getting respect': The coaching behaviors of an expert English soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 7(2), 183-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1357332022000018869>
- Readdy, T., Zakrajsek, R., & Raabe, J. (2016). Real-world experiences of the coaching pathos: Orchestration of NCAA Division I Sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 30(2), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.1123.tsp.2015.0054>
- Rocha, C. M., & Chelladurai, P. (2011). Relationship between organizational support and performance of college coaches: A mediated model. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(3), 301-319. doi: 10.1080/16184742.2011.577793
- Rodolfa, E., Bent, R., Eisman, E., Nelson, P., Rehm, L., & Ritchie, P. (2005). A cube model for competency development: Implications for psychology educators and regulators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 36(4), 347. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.36.4.347>
- Roller, M. (2012, November). Interviewer bias and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Research Design Review: A Discussion of Qualitative & Quantitative Research Design Issues*. Retrieved from <https://researchdesignreview.com/2012/11/14/interviewer-bias-reflexivity-in-qualitative-research/>
- Rossi, T., & Cassidy, T. (1999). Knowledgeable teachers in physical education: A view of teachers' knowledge. In E.A. Hardy, & M. Mawer, *Learning and Teaching in Physical Education* (pp. 188-201). London: Falmer.
- Rynne, S. B., & Mallett, C. J. (2012). Understanding the work and learning of high performance coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 17(5), 507-523. doi: 10.1080/17408989.2011.621119

- Sabock, M. D., & Sabock, R. J. (2017). *Coaching: A Realistic Perspective*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sage, G. H. (1989). Becoming a high school coach: From playing sport to coaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 60(1), 81-92.
- Santos, S., Jones, R.L., & Mesquita, I. (2013). Do coaches orchestrate? The working practices of elite Portuguese coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 84, 1-10. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2013.784722
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Silva, J. M. (2006). Psychological aspects of competition: An interview with Anson Dorrance head women's soccer coach at the University of North Carolina. *Journal of Excellence*, 11, 88-102.
- Skinner, B. F. (1988). *The Selection of Behavior: The Operant Behaviorism of BF Skinner: Comments and Consequences*. CUP Archive.
- Sotiriadou, P., & De Bosscher, V. (2018). Managing high-performance sport: introduction to past, present, and future considerations. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 18, 1-7. doi: 10.1080/16184742.2017.1400225
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Steinbach, P. (2007, April). NCAA schools tackle institutional expectations of coaches conduct. *Athletic Business*. Retrieved from: <https://www.athleticbusiness.com/College/ncaa-schools-tackle-institutional-expectations-of-coaches-conduct.html>.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. Psychology Press.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1976). What a coach can teach a teacher. *Psychology Today*, 9(8), 75-78.

Thomson, N. (2003). *Theory and practice in the human services*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

United States Department of Education (2017). Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (EADA). Retrieved from <https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/#/>

United States Olympic Committee (2017). *Quality Coaching Framework*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, P. L. (1998). Using theories of professional knowledge and reflective practice to influence educational change. *Medical Teacher*, 20(1), 28-34. doi: 10.1080/01421599881444

Wrisberg, C. A. (1990). An interview with Pat Head Summitt. *The Sport Psychologist*, 4(2), 180-191. doi: 10.1123/tsp.4.2.180

APPENDIX H

Table 4

International Sport Coaching Framework: Coaching Roles

Coach Level	Roles/Duties:
Advanced/Senior Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans, delivers, leads and evaluates coaching sessions. • Extended and integrated knowledge, competence, and decision making to deliver the primary functions and to mentor others. • Works independently and plays a leading role in the structure of the program. • Manages the development of coaches, coaching assistants, and pre-coaches
Master/Head Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversees and contributes to the delivery, review, and evaluation of programs over seasons in medium to large-scale contexts, underpinned by innovation and research • Specialist and integrated level of knowledge and competence, recognized as an expert with highly developed decision-making skills. • Often involved in designing and overseeing management structures and development programs for other coaches.

(ICCE, 2013, p. 26)

APPENDIX I

Table 5

Comparing the Tasks of High-Performance Coaches

Maclean & Chelladurai (1995)	Rynne & Mallett (2012)
Direct task behaviors	Hands on coaching
Indirect task behaviors	Personal support for athletes (serving as a pseudo-parent role; developing life skills)
Pastoral care (interest in the broader personal development of the athlete)	Talent identification and selection
Administrative behaviors	Programming Managing a program/squad Managing support staff Research involvement
Public relations behaviors	Liaising with stakeholders Representing the State Institute of Sport (SIS)
	Sharing with other coaches (generally with lower level SIS coaches to bring them up in the organization)

APPENDIX J

Table 6

Division I Head Women's Soccer Coach Job Description from the NCAA Marketplace

University/Program & Responsibilities	Qualifications
<p>Seton Hall Head Women's Soccer Coach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organize and direct team practices • Recruit and retain athletically and academically qualified student-athletes. • Create a safe, positive environment for student-athletes • Pass the annual NCAA Coaches Certification Test. • Maintain documents for compliance. • Determine the distribution of athletically-related financial aid. • Schedule competition • Support the mission and goals of the university and athletics department • Maintain budget • Maintain documentation of expenditures • Secure travel • Procure equipment • Attend compliance reviews • Emphasize & enforce student-athlete code of conduct • Practice professionalism and sportsmanship • Promote a positive image of the university • Participate on university and departmental committees • Support sports information office with information for publicity purposes • Support marketing efforts through appearances and promotions • Support fundraising activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor's degree required • 1-3 years of experience as an NCAA soccer coach or club coach • Preferred qualifications: USSF "C" license or higher or NSCAA equivalent • Candidate must pass the most current NCAA compliance certification test
<p>Yale University Head Women's Soccer Coach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teach and coach all technical aspects of game preparation and game strategy • Direct competitions and practice, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 years collegiate coaching experience • Knowledge of effective coaching techniques and best practices

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct administrative activities • Develop and determine the recruitment program • Oversee fundraising activities • Supervises and directs activities of assistant coaches • Manages team budget • Promotes a positive image of the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with school administrators, parents, students, and alums • Demonstrate knowledge of NCAA rules and regulations • Ability to maintain confidentiality • Demonstrate ability to communicate effectively with stakeholders • Strong verbal and written skills • Ability to work flexible schedule, including evenings and weekends
<hr/> <p>University of Texas at El Paso Head Women's Soccer Coach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for team performance in practice and competition • Organizing and managing student-athlete development, recruiting, team travel, game scheduling, scouting of opponents, budget management, and strength and conditioning • Responsible for participating in community events, public speaking, and summer camp instruction. • Appoints, supervises, and evaluates staff • Develops and monitors academic progress through graduation rates and APR scores • Keep records of recruiting activities • Keep records of playing/practice seasons • Monitor student-athlete eligibility • Successfully complete NCAA certification test • Actively promotes women's soccer program on campus and in the community • Fundraising 	<hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor's degree • 2 - 5 years coaching experience

(NCAA, 2019b)

APPENDIX K

Recruiting Email

Dear Coach,

This letter is a request for you to take part in a research project to explore the professional work of NCAA Division I women's head soccer coaches. This project is being conducted by Lynda Bowers, M.S.Ed in the department of Athletic Coaching Education with supervision by Dr. Kristen Dieffenbach, an associate professor in the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences, for a Doctorate Degree in Coaching and Teaching Studies. The overarching purpose of the study is to define what a Division I coach does and how they describe their roles, tasks, requisite knowledge, and coaching processes within an FBS athletic organization.

Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated. It will take approximately five minutes to fill out the Qualtrics survey. The survey will gather some general demographic data about you and your coaching career. The final question in the survey will ask if you would like to consider an interview with the lead researcher. To obtain full depth and breadth of the work of a coach, it is necessary to hear from the coaches, themselves. The interview would take approximately 60 – 75 minutes and would be performed via video chat or face to face (depending on both preference and proximity to the researcher's location).

Your involvement in this project will be kept as confidential as legally possible. All data will be reported in the aggregate. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate. I will not ask any information that should lead back to your identity as a participant. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may skip any question that you do not wish to answer, and you may discontinue at any time. There is no consequence if you decide either not to participate or to withdraw. West Virginia University's Institutional Review Board acknowledgement of this project is on file.

I hope that you will participate in this research project, as it could be beneficial in understanding the work of NCAA Division I soccer coaches. Thank you very much for your time. Should you have any questions about this letter or the research project, please feel free to contact Lynda Bowers at (907) 252-2561 or by e-mail at leb0016@mix.wvu.edu. Please click on the link below to begin the survey.

Qualtrics Link: https://wvu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_07lwQcdIOdvPLo1

Thank you for your time and help with this project.

Sincerely,

Lynda Bowers

APPENDIX L

Qualtrics Survey

NCAA Soccer Coach_survey.consent

Q1

Welcome to the research study!

I am interested in understanding the professional work of NCAA Division I soccer coaches. You will be presented with demographic questions that verify information from your institution's athletic website. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential. The survey should only take a few moments to complete.

The final question asks if you would be willing to participate in an interview with the lead researcher to discuss the professional components of your work. Agreeing to participate does not obligate you in any way to do the interview. It would, however, mean that you are interested in the study and would allow the researcher to contact you in the near future to discuss the research project and then decide if you would like to schedule the interview. The interview completion time is estimated at 60-75 minutes.

As a final note, your participation in this research is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any point during the study, for any reason, and without any prejudice. If you would like to contact the Principal Investigator in the study to discuss this research, please e-mail Lynda Bowers leb0016@mix.wvu.edu.

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

- ☐ I consent, begin the study (1)
- ☐ I do not consent, I do not wish to participate (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Welcome to the research study! I am interested in understanding the professional work of NCAA... = I do not consent, I do not wish to participate

Q3 Please verify your name and institution where you work. (E.g. Jenny Smith, University of America)

Q4 Please indicate the number of years you have worked as a head soccer coach at the Division I level.

- ☐ 0 - 9 (1)
- ☐ 10 - 15 (2)
- ☐ 16 - 20 (3)
- ☐ 20+ (4)

Q5 Please indicate the number of years you have worked at a FBS/Division IA school as a head women's soccer coach.

- ☐ 0 - 4 (1)
- ☐ 5 - 10 (2)
- ☐ 11 - 15 (3)
- ☐ 16 - 20 (4)
- ☐ 20+ (5)

Q6 Please indicate your approximate winning percentage as a Division I head women's soccer coach.

Q7 How many times have you been selected as a conference or national "Coach of the Year" as a NCAA Division I women's soccer head coach?

- ☐ Never (1)
- ☐ 1 - 3 times (2)
- ☐ 4 - 6 times (3)
- ☐ 7 - 9 times (4)
- ☐ ten or more times (5)

Q8 Approximately how many NCAA or NSCAA All-Americans have you coached as a NCAA Division I women's soccer coach?

- ☐ none (1)

- ☐ 1 - 5 (2)
- ☐ 6 - 10 (3)
- ☐ 11 - 15 (4)
- ☐ 16 - 20 (5)
- ☐ 20+ (6)

Q9 Would you be willing to interview in a study about the professional work of NCAA Division I head women's soccer coaches?

▼ Yes (1) ... Maybe (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Would you be willing to interview in a study about the professional work of NCAA Division I head... = No

Skip To: Q10 If Would you be willing to interview in a study about the professional work of NCAA Division I head... = Yes

Skip To: Q10 If Would you be willing to interview in a study about the professional work of NCAA Division I head... = Maybe

Q10 Thank you for your interest in helping me with my research! Please select the best way to contact you to further discuss my research project and setting up an interview.

- ☐ Email (1)
- ☐ Phone (2)
- ☐ I've decided not to participate (3)

Display This Question:

If Thank you for your interest in helping me with my research! Please select the best way to contact... = Email

Q11 Please enter your email address.

Display This Question:

If Thank you for your interest in helping me with my research! Please select the best way to contact... = Phone

Q12 Please include your telephone number and a good time/date to reach you.

APPENDIX M

Follow Up Communication for Interview Scheduling**Email:**

Dear *Coach*,

My name is Lynda Bowers and I am a doctoral student at West Virginia University. Thank you for considering my dissertation project entitled, "Toward an understanding of the professional work of NCAA Division I soccer coaches." Because of your exceptional coaching career as a Division I head soccer coach, you were identified as an expert coach. Your involvement will help to bring a greater understanding about the real work experiences of a collegiate coach within the FBS subdivision. Ultimately, I want to use this information to help create quality professional development opportunities for collegiate coaches that are meaningful and useful. If you agree to move on with the interview portion of the study, we need to confirm a time to either meet online via video chat (Skype, Zoom, etc.), or face to face (if you work in proximity to the researcher). Please note that the interview will last approximately 60-75 minutes, and it will be recorded (with permission). After the interview, I will transcribe the recording and send it for your review. If there is anything within the transcript that you feel needs editing or was misrepresented, you can provide that feedback and I will make the necessary changes.

The interview will cover the following topics:

1. Your roles as a Division I soccer coach
2. The professional or organizational components of your job (off the field)
3. The tasks that you perform
4. The knowledge required to do your work from a professional/organizational perspective AND within your coaching practice
5. Your coaching process (thought processes and actions to achieve desired outcomes)
6. Your perspective on formal coaching education

Please let me know a time and day that would fit into your schedule to interview with me. You can respond to this email leb0016@mix.wvu.edu or call/text me at 907.252.2561. I look forward to talking with you.

Best,

Lynda Bowers, M.S.Ed
West Virginia University
College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences

Phone Script:

Hello *Coach*,

My name is Lynda Bowers and I am a doctoral student at West Virginia University. I am calling to follow up with you regarding a recent survey that you completed regarding the work of NCAA Division I soccer coaches. Is now a good time to talk?

Thank you for considering my dissertation project. I want to spend a few moments giving you some more information about the study. Please feel free to ask me any questions during this call. Participation in this study will require completing an interview. Interviews can be done by video chat with Skype or Zoom or a face to face interview if you are within 100 miles of my location. Interviews will last between 60 – 75 minutes and will be recorded with your permission. After the interview, I will transcribe the recording and send it for your review. If there is anything within the transcript that you feel needs editing or was misrepresented, you can provide that feedback and I will make the necessary changes.

I am interested in learning about what you do as a professional coach working within a Division I FBS institution. So, although we will discuss some of your on-field duties, I'd like to focus on the things that you do off the field that gives us a picture of you as a professional working within an institution of higher education. So, some of the questions will hover around the following topics:

1. Your roles as a Division I soccer coach
2. The professional or organizational components of your job (off the field)
3. The tasks that you perform
4. The knowledge required to do your work from a professional/organizational perspective AND within your coaching practice
5. Your coaching process (thought processes and actions to achieve desired outcomes)
6. Your perspective on formal coaching education

Do you have any questions?

Is there a date and time that would fit into your schedule to interview with me?

Thank you. I look forward to the interview.

APPENDIX N

Interview Guide

Introduction:

Coach X, thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. As an expert in your field, much of what you do is probably so automatic that you don't have to think about the details of what you do or how you do it. You just know. But for others, the components of your work and how you have come to know how to do it is a mystery. So, today I'd like to tease out some of that tacit knowledge to discover more about the professional components of your job. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me?

-----begin recording-----

I am speaking with Coach [X] from [X]. Thank you Coach for your participation in this research study.

To start I want to read you a short scenario. After I am finished, I will ask you some questions that are framed around the scenario.

Part I: Vignette introduction and description of the professional working environment

Coach Smith has been working at a very successful NCAA DII soccer program for the past 5 years. Coach Smith was a former player for the US National team, and also had a successful professional career. The coach has been around the collegiate, national, and professional game for a long time, but has never coached at a DI school. Coach Smith has recently been offered a head coach position at a NCAA DI FBS institution. The coach respects your wisdom as both a soccer coach and a professional and would like to pick your brain about some of the expectations of working in this context. The two of you meet for coffee to discuss some of the "unwritten" components of a DI head coaching job. You try to think back to a time when you were in Coach Smith's shoes to remember some of your initial impressions of your first DI head coaching job. Coach Smith begins the conversation by asking, "What is it like working at a NCAA DI FBS university as opposed to other coaching environments?"

[probe participant with the following questions if not answered in the first question]

- *How would you explain a typical day on the job to Coach Smith?*
 - *What about an atypical day?*
- *What are the challenges and rewards of working within an athletic environment like this?*
- *Who will Coach Smith need to work with at the new job? How do they impact the work of a head coach?*
- *How does being an employee within a university influence the way you coach?*
- *As you continue your conversation with Coach Smith, you are reminded of some of the "hard-learned" lessons from when you first started your collegiate head coaching*

career. What is something that you wish someone would've told you when you began your head-coaching journey that you would like to pass on to Coach Smith?

Part II: Discovering coaching roles

Coach Smith understands that collegiate coaching often means that the coach's role goes beyond coaching, and so he/she is curious about what "hats" you wear, especially as a head coach at an FBS institution. Can you describe the hats you wear and what you have to know to be able to wear each hat?

[probe: How did you learn how to fill these roles?]

Part III: Discover what you have to know to do the job

After talking with Coach Smith for a while, you get the impression that he/she knows the game of soccer but might not totally understand how a soccer program works at a DI FBS school. If you were to give Coach Smith a list of "things you should prep for or read up on before entering the job, what would that list look like?" Why do you think so?

- *Can you tell me how you came to know the items on the list?*

Part IV: Discover coaching objectives and processes of goal achievement

As you continue your conversation with Coach Smith, he/she has had a chance to share with you his/her coaching experiences over the past several years at a DII school, and you begin to think about some of the similarities and differences regarding the objectives of your job and the ways in which you go about achieving your goals. Can you tell me which coaching objectives are universal to collegiate coaching and which are unique to a DI FBS school? [Probe: Why do you think so?]

Coach Smith is curious about your success. He/she wants to know how you go about achieving your coaching objectives? Coach Smith asks you, "What's your secret?" [probe: Think about who is involved? What has to happen to be successful? What does goal achievement execution look like in your job?]

Part V: Discover the responsibilities/tasks of a NCAA DI soccer coach

*As you and Coach Smith continue your conversation about the components of your job, he/she is wondering if your duties are different than a Division II coaching job. What would you say are **the primary responsibilities of being a professional coach within your organization?** (probe - is that your personal philosophy or is that the message you get from the university?)*

As we move on, I would like you to read a real job description for a DI coach. Afterwards, I am going to ask you some questions about the responsibilities listed, and how they compare (in reality) to your job.

[Participant reads the following job description]

Job summary: The head women's soccer coach reports directly to the Director of Athletics and is responsible for managing and coaching the women's soccer program.

Duties and responsibilities of the head women's soccer coach:

- Oversee and manage all aspects of the women's soccer program including but not limited to competition, practice, compliance, budget, academics, student conduct and development.
- Responsible for conducting all practices and competitions necessary to accomplish the objectives of the women's soccer program within the guidelines of the University, conference, and NCAA rules.
- Responsible for recruiting highly skilled student-athletes for the women's soccer team.
- Responsible for adhering to and orienting student-athletes to the policies and regulations of the University, Department of Athletics, Conference, and NCAA.
- Oversee the conduct and discipline of student-athletes on the women's soccer team.
- Work with admissions office and the office of compliance and student services with the enrollment of student-athletes.
- In consultation with the Director of Athletics and the development staff of the University, assist in raising private funds for the women's soccer program.
- Counsel student-athletes in sport participation and personal development.
- Coordinate and perform budget and expense related activities for the women's soccer program, including: team travel, meals, per diem, equipment, facilities, and recruiting.
- Manage women's soccer staff including assistant coaches and other administrative positions.
- Performs other job-related duties as assigned by the Director of Athletics.

Now that we have taken a closer look at your duties and responsibilities, did you notice if there missing duties and/or responsibilities from the job description? (probe - what would you add?) Feel free to write these on your hard copy.

Part VI: Perspectives on coaching education

Put yourself in Coach Smith's shoes and think back to your first DI head coaching job, in what ways were you prepared and/or underprepared for this position?

Coach Smith just received a USSF B coaching license. Thinking back to your experiences in formal coach education can you tell me about the parts of your educational experiences that were particularly enriching? What about the experiences that seemed irrelevant?

- *What are some other ways that you stay sharp in your profession?*
- *If you were to design a coaching education or professional development curriculum, what would you include? (probe - why is this important?)*

Part VII: advice to future coaches/final remarks

Is there anything that you'd like to add about the nature of your work that is unique to the DI context that we may have missed?

Thank you for your time. [END]

APPENDIX O

NCAA DI FBS Head Women's Soccer Coach Job Description

Job summary: The head women's soccer coach reports directly to the Director of Athletics and is responsible for managing and coaching the women's soccer program.

Duties and responsibilities of the head women's soccer coach:

Oversee and manage all aspects of the women's soccer program including but not limited to competition, practice, compliance, budget, academics, student conduct and development.

- Responsible for conducting all practices and competitions necessary to accomplish the objectives of the women's soccer program within the guidelines of the University, conference, and NCAA rules.
- Responsible for recruiting highly skilled student-athletes for the women's soccer team.
- Responsible for adhering to and orienting student-athletes to the policies and regulations of the University, Department of Athletics, Conference, and NCAA.
- Oversee the conduct and discipline of student-athletes on the women's soccer team.
- Work with admissions office and the office of compliance and student services with the enrollment of student-athletes.
- In consultation with the Director of Athletics and the development staff of the University, assist in raising private funds for the women's soccer program.
- Counsel student-athletes in sport participation and personal development.
- Coordinate and perform budget and expense-related activities for the women's soccer program, including team travel, meals, per diem, equipment, facilities, and recruiting.
- Manage women's soccer staff including assistant coaches and other administrative positions.
- Performs other job-related duties as assigned by the Director of Athletics.

(NCAA, 2019b)

APPENDIX P

Table 7

Table of Coding Frequencies

Category	Frequency (f)	Higher order theme	f	Lower-order theme	f	Summary codes	f
DI Contextual Characteristics	118	DI Contextual Characteristics	118	Resources	51	Financial	7
						Human Resources	42
				Pressure to Win	21	External pressure	16
						Internal pressure	4
Job Responsibilities	243	Tasks	214	Direct coaching tasks	36	player development	14
						team training	22
				Indirect coaching tasks	79	recruiting	45
						talent identification	5
						red flags	17
						player management	16
				Occupational tasks	99	administration	14
						compliance	14
						budgeting	10
						public relations/media	6
						university employee- specific tasks	12
		Objectives	27	Winning	17	winning a championship	6
						impact of winning	7
				Student-athlete experience	11	maximizing potential	5
						special experiences	5
Coaching Processes	225	Philosophy	59	Coach leadership philosophy	54	leadership style	14
						leading staff	16
						coaching attitudes	6
						player development	21

Knowledge Requirements	180	Methods	165	Recruiting methods	93	budgeting scholarships/financial aid	6
						efficiency in recruiting	23
						knowing your niche	15
						international recruiting	4
						building a recruiting network	18
		Coaching roles	59	Head coaching roles	49	Building Culture	71
						setting standards	24
						creating buy-in	23
						CEO	23
						parent mentor	4 5
		Requisite knowledge for DI	121	professional knowledge	37	sport science	18
						sport psychology	6
						training theory	11
				interpersonal knowledge	28	communication	3
						relationships	13
						trust	5
				intrapersonal knowledge		self-awareness	1
						reflection	3
						understanding purpose	4
				occupational knowledge		administration	7
						conflict resolution	6
						human resource management	9
Job Challenges	75	Job challenges	75	coaching challenges	46	adaptations to Generation Z recruiting	32 7
				occupational challenges	29	Work-life balance social media	5 4

APPENDIX Q

Table 3

Table of Extended Categories and Themes

Category	Higher-order and Lower-order Themes	Descriptions	Exemplar Quote/s
DI Contextual Characteristics	DI Contextual Resources	Great financial resources for operating budget, recruitment, travel, salaries, support personnel, scholarships & facilities	<i>When I got to DI it was a lot more checks and balances and I think you've got to really understand you're at a much bigger team environment, which is great in a sense because you feel like you've got resources and you've got support (Charlie).</i>
	Pressure	Pressure to win is heightened with greater financial resources; pressure is both internal and external	<i>But I think now the expectation for all the Olympic sports is you know we want success, and you don't see as much longevity with coaches now if they're not successful after four or five years so [DI coaches] are gonna have added pressure (Pat).</i>
	Elite Level	DI is an elite athletic environment that has elite athletes and competition.	<i>When you go from DII to DI, I found the level of play that you are working with was the more elite player (Charlie).</i>
	Considering the Student-Athlete	Coaches must consider the needs of the student. This involves managing academic schedules and demanding academic excellence.	<i>[The] academic piece is something that I take seriously... You know. There's no shortcuts here, for students, I mean. That's why I have so much respect for our kids [and] how they managed to have a 3.6 GPA in the year that we went to the final four (Finley).</i>

Job Responsibilities	Tasks		
	Direct Coaching Tasks	Tasks involving direct coaching. Summary codes: player development and training plans	<i>You have to log in how many hours of practice every week and then every month and then how many days off, and so all of that. You've got to log in your phone calls (Pat).</i>
	Indirect Coaching Tasks	Tasks involving indirect coaching. Summary codes: recruiting, talent identification, player management	
	Occupational Tasks	Employee-related, non-coaching tasks. Summary codes: administration, budgeting, public relations/media, university employee-specific tasks	<i>...the president of the university [asks me to speak] ...I do a lot with the university (Sidney).</i>
	Objectives		
	Winning	The job is about doing everything possible to win.	<i>If I come in here in two or three years and I'm not winning, ...I'm still not going to get those top kids because we're not winning (Pat).</i>
	Student-Athlete Experience	Balancing training, academics, and social activities to maximize student-athlete enjoyment of their collegiate experience.	<i>I want [the players] to feel like this was as close to professional soccer as it could be, and there were no shortcuts or cutbacks to prevent them from enjoying the experience (Charlie).</i>
Coaching Processes	Philosophy		
	Coach Leadership Philosophy	Coach ideas about how they choose to lead their players and staff, including player autonomy, holistic player development, leadership style, motivation, and mentorship.	<i>...when you drive the culture it's really what is important to this program and to this family... But, most important, to me and my philosophy. So, I have to drive the philosophies that I stand behind every day (Sidney).</i>
	Playing Philosophy	Coach ideas about training and playing style.	<i>I have to know what I want my team to look like...stay true to how you want to teach your team to play and then find players and people that will, you know, fit that system (Pat).</i>

	Methods Recruiting Methods	Process of recruiting, including how to be efficient with time and money, knowing your recruiting niche, knowing where to recruit, building a network, and international recruiting.	<i>I feel like one of the biggest parts of my job is making sure that players and club directors of coaching... know who we are and what we're about and that we have a high interest level in their players (Charlie).</i>
	Building Culture	Process of building culture includes setting standards of behavior and performance and creating team buy-in to meet expectations.	<i>...you've got to really establish the culture you want. The culture will overcome anything. You'll overcome drama; you'll overcome a violation; you'll overcome any sort of misdemeanor...the strength of the culture will help that player grow, the team [to] grow (Charlie).</i>
Knowledge Requirements	Coaching Roles		
	Head Coach Roles	The varying functions assumed by the coach that may or may not involve direct coaching.	<i>...you're almost like a CEO of your own company, you know...because you've got to have your hands in everything (Pat).</i>
	Support Staff Roles	The varying functions assumed by the support staff that may or may not involve direct coaching.	<i>I think the bottom group sometimes feel like I don't care. [They think] what [they're] doing doesn't add value to the group. I think our volunteer helps with that (Finley).</i>
	Requisite knowledge for DI		
	Professional Knowledge	Includes sport-specific knowledge, coaching pedagogy, science of coaching (“-ologies”) Summary codes: sport science, sport psychology, training theory	<i>... there's a lot that goes in [a training plan] and then just, you know, a piece of paper and YouTube. A great session has to have purpose. It has to be effective and [it] has to be have high performance but high recovery (Sidney).</i>
	Occupational Knowledge	Includes job-specific knowledge. Summary codes: administration, accounting and budgeting, marketing and branding, compliance and recruiting, and prioritizing tasks	<i>You know you can't be afraid of confrontation. ...every day you have to deal with conflict when you deal with human beings...I don't run a dictatorship here, so there's a lot of agreeing to disagree” (Sidney).</i>
	Interpersonal Knowledge	Communication and social interactions involving coaches, athletes, support staff	<i>You have to convince them that you care about them and their welfare, and not just a means to your coaching win-loss record (Finley).</i>

	Intrapersonal Knowledge	Self-monitoring and reflective activity of coaching decisions; understanding purpose; self-awareness	<i>.... I look back now of me as a younger coach...Oh my God...I'm embarrassed by some of the things I did and said (Finley).</i>
Job Challenges	Job Challenges Coaching Challenges Occupational Challenges	Challenges specific to the job of coaching (e.g. players, recruiting, training, etc.) Challenges specific to the non-coaching components of the job (e.g. time-management, work-life balance, social media, gaining influence, budgeting etc.)	<i>This generation [is different] than 20 years ago...you have to explain to them why you do what you do and not just say run through that wall. They're going to say, 'but why coach?' Back 10 years ago, they'd just run through the wall (Sidney).</i> <i>It's very hard for me...you know, I have three children at home, too. And then I have to recruit. And again, here goes 'glass balls/rubber balls.' So, I am always trying to balance all that (Sidney).</i>
Coach Learning	Learning modes Professional Coach Development Occupational Learning Informal Learning	Includes all formal learning experiences (e.g. coaching courses, purposeful trips to observe program methods, intentionality of enhancing skills and/or knowledge specific to direct and indirect coaching tasks and behaviors). Learning to do the non-coaching specific components of the job (e.g. administration, athletic department duties, human resource management, etc.) Learning from observing other coaches, informal mentorship relationships, learning by cumulative experience, familial influences	<i>You know I was a fast horse so therefore; I'd be a great jockey...really, my eyes were opened. Teaching the game and knowing the game were night and day (Finley).</i> <i>I started as a young coach with the NAIA level, and before I got my first DI full-time job, I had to wear all the hats. You know, I had to mow my field, line my field. I had to put the nets up before games. You did everything, you know. You didn't have a maintenance crew that took care of it; you didn't have game management people that handled making sure you got an ambulance and trainers and doctors...so, I think it's a really good learning tool for young coaches to have to go through that – wearing more of those hats to understand and appreciate (Pat).</i> <i>We're always watching, you know, watching our men's coach, how he does practices. I'll go and watch professional teams train, and...[I've] been to watch Manchester City...we've been to Liverpool...so we are always watching; I'm always stealing ideas (Finley).</i>

	Non-formal Learning	Learning from reading, searching the internet, watching games, self-study, etc.	<i>I'll record ten or twelve matches a week. I'll watch three or four from an enjoyment standpoint...then I watch the same three or four from a learning standpoint (Charlie).</i>
	Moving forward Advice	Wisdom to up and coming coaches about coaching in the NCAA DI context	<i>I think the best advice I could give is...take a look at a big picture and try to come up with your playing philosophy, whatever that is (Pat).</i>
	Enhancing Curriculum	Suggestions from coaches about what should be in a formal coaching curriculum for collegiate coaches.	<i>I would definitely do hiring staff...recruiting the right kid...player development...(Sidney).</i>